

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 01871256 2



Q
52
23
6
4

2



Rt. Rev. T. M. Malone

MGR. THE BISHOP OF ORLEANS,

AND

MGR. THE ARCHBISHOP OF MALINES.

FIRST LETTER

TO

MONSEIGNEUR DECHAMPS,

BY

A. GRATRY,

Prêtre de l'Oratoire, Membre de l'Académie Française.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH BY

T. J. BAILEY, B.A.,

Priest of the Church of England.

LONDON :

J. T. HAYES, LYALL PLACE.

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO., PATERNOSTER ROW.

BRIGHTON: G. WAKELING.

It is understood that this letter, like all my other works, simply represents the opinion of the author, and does not bind the Oratoire in any way.

A. GRATRY,

Priest of the Oratoire,
Member of the Academy:

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE.

As several of the translations, of which the Latin text is given, are not strictly literal, I think it right to add that the translations are made from the French of Father Gratry, and not exclusively from the Latin.

T. J. B.

DEC 27 1958

FIRST LETTER TO MONSEIGNEUR THE
ARCHBISHOP OF MALINES.

MONSEIGNEUR,

In your reply to the *Observations* of the Bishop of Orleans, you complain of the cry of alarm raised by the illustrious Bishop at the aspect of the present danger of the Church. You are filled with grief on this account, and you tell him that there is neither danger nor doubt in the path in which you bid him follow your steps.

To me, Monseigneur, it seems the contrary; and this I now endeavour to prove to you, praying you to grant me all the attention of your enlightened mind and generous heart. I ask you to allow me to enjoy the benefit of that charming humility which is characteristic of you, and which will permit you to listen to an opponent, placed, in every way, so far below you.

I hope to be able to show you, Monseigneur, that, in your reply to the Bishop of Orleans, you have been working upon false documents. By reason of the rapidity of that work for which "at this moment you had not sufficient leisure," you have not been able yourself to verify all the passages. They have abused your confidence. Did not the same thing happen to S. Thomas Aquinas, in regard to his tract, "*Contra*

errores Græcorum?” The Dominican de Rubeis admits the fact in the edition of 1754.¹ He only defends the good faith of the great and holy doctor, which was in no wise necessary, any more than it is needful, Monseigneur, to defend your own. The greatest minds and the noblest hearts are always more easily deceived than others. They never suspect a fraud. They do not imagine a falsehood, and so do not believe it. Now, Monseigneur, the same passages which deceived Saint Thomas—and many other falsifications, both ancient as well as recent ones—have deceived you directly or indirectly.

I speak, Monseigneur, of falsifications properly so called. I speak of interpolations and fraudulent mutilations, introduced into the most certain and most venerable texts. This you shall see for yourself, and there can be no dispute.

I affirm—and you will see it too, Monseigneur—I affirm that there is a school of apologetics, amongst whom are found holy men, some of the greatest minds, and many excellent Christians, who are all deceived together by the blind passion of a certain number of writers and theologians, by the partial good faith of several of them, and, lastly, by falsehoods properly so called and by falsifications knowingly practised.

All this is necessary, Monseigneur, to explain what this school both says and commits to print

See “*Admonitio prævia ad opusculum primum.*” Father Nicolai, in the edition of 1660 (Paris), was already upon the traces of the frauds which deceived Saint Thomas.

upon one of the grandest facts of all ecclesiastical history—upon the fact of Pope Honorius and the VI. Council. All this is necessary, to explain what Mgr. Manning has written upon this subject, as well as to explain your own reply upon that point and others, to the Bishop of Orleans.

The facts are as follows :—

I. The question is, whether Pope Honorius was condemned as heretical by the VI. Council, or no. Now, the school of which I speak, and whose arguments you adopt, without having, I am bold to say, sufficiently verified them for yourself—this school, I say, now undertakes this: It maintains and intends to prove that Honorius was not heretical, although he was condemned as such by three Œcumenical Councils approved of by Popes, and, moreover, by two Roman Councils over which Popes presided.

They admit, mark it well, that Honorius was condemned, in express terms, as heretical by those three Councils; but they maintain, in spite of that, that he is not heretical. “Certainly,” says one of the defenders of this argument, “I read in the “VI. Council these words: ‘Anathema to the heretic Honorius;’ ‘*Anathema Honorio hæretico.*’ But the “question is, What is the meaning of this word “‘*hæretico*’? We must again determine the sense of “the word by the circumstances under which it was “pronounced, instead of inferring the nature of the

“crime condemned from the word employed to express it.”¹

Therefore, according to this mode of arguing, when I hear read a sentence of condemnation for theft or homicide, I am not to “infer the nature of the crime from the word employed to express it.” The man condemned in express terms for homicide is perhaps only condemned for theft.

Thus, from the fact of the VI. Council, as they admit, declaring Honorius heretical, I have not the right to infer that Honorius was condemned as heretical. Instead of “inferring the nature of the crime from the word employed to express it,” I must first examine the word, and see whether it could not mean something else besides heretical, which would allow me to say, with due respect to the VI. Council, and, in fact, relying upon it for support, that Honorius was not heretical. Unhappily for this absurd argument, it is, in this particular case, absolutely impracticable; for, as the Council enumerates all the heretics which it condemns on the ground of monothelism, and condemns them all uniformly and consecutively by the same word, “*Anathema Sergio* “*hæretico, anathema Honorio hæretico, anathema Pyrrho* “*hæretico,*” it is impossible to maintain that the word “heretical” in this continuous passage has two different meanings—one for Sergius and Pyrrhus and the other for Honorius, who stands between

¹ “Etudes religieuses,” Décembre, 1869, p. 841.

them both. It is a pitiful evasion, which I am, perhaps, wrong to qualify in such gentle terms.

Another supporter of the same system, whilst admitting, as he must do, the fact of the condemnation, gets out of the difficulty in this way: Yes, the Pope was wrong. The fault of this Pope consists in “*a, perhaps exaggerated, consideration (des ménagements pent-être exaggués)*. . . . It “is this which authorised the Fathers to envelope “him in the anathemas against the heretics. . . . “Once assimilated to these, he could be treated as “they were.”

Therefore, a Pope who should only be guilty of having entertained, either for doctrines or persons, “*a, perhaps exaggerated, consideration*”—this Pope, for that alone, authorises his judges to envelope him in the crime of heresy. Once enveloped thus amongst heretics and assimilated to them, there is no longer anything to *be cautious about*. He may be overwhelmed, his writings burnt, himself anathematized and expelled from the Catholic Church. An innocent man may thus be at first *enveloped*, then *assimilated*, and then *condemned*.

See, then, whither the wish to solve the following problem may lead: 1st, to admit the authority of Œcumenical Councils; 2nd, to admit, as one is compelled to do, that these Councils condemned Honorius as heretical; and, 3rd, to maintain that Honorius was not a heretic. This, Monseigneur, is the dilemma in which they have succeeded in placing you.

Mgr. Manning has in this exposed himself to a real danger. If I believe his own words, he resists utterly and entirely the three Councils. He knows as well as we do every passage of these Councils which condemn Honorius as heretical. What, then, does he oppose to them? The very letters of Honorius. Mgr. Manning, if I believe my own eyes, seems to invite the readers, to whom his charge is addressed, to judge for themselves these letters, burnt as heretical by the VI. Council, but which, happily, have survived until now, to prove the orthodoxy of the excommunicated Pope. The passage is as follows: "Heretical he could not be, for his own letters remain to prove the orthodoxy of his teaching." With such simplicity as this do they annul the judgment of three Œcumenical Councils. With such resolutions as this do they expose themselves to everything, when a matter so important is in question.

Now, to what danger does Mgr. Manning expose himself? Shall I dare to say? It is to the danger of excommunication. Extraordinary as it may seem, Mgr. Manning, by this bold proceeding with regard to three general Councils, by his formal approbation of a writing condemned as *impious, pernicious, heretical, burnt* as such by the VI. Council—Mgr. Manning, I repeat, if we look at the matter literally and strictly, has evidently incurred excommunication *ipso facto* or *latæ sententiæ*, enunciated in title I. of the recent bull of Pius IX., which runs thus: Are

subject to excommunication *ipso facto* or *latæ sententiæ*
 “all and singular heretics of whatsoever name. . . .
 “as well as all those who favour *and defend them in*
 “*any manner whatever.*” “Omnes ac singulos
 “hæreticos quocunque nomine censeantur. . . .
 “eorumque fautores ac generaliter quoslibet defen-
 “sores.”

II. But, leaving Mgr. Manning to the peril of anathema to which he has exposed himself, I return, Monseigneur, to your letter. In it I read, I confess with amazement, these words which you address to the Bishop of Orleans. “How could your Grace
 “have had the courage to recall the questions
 “already decided of Liberius, Vigilius, and Hono-
 “rius? As to Honorius, far from teaching mono-
 “thelism in his letters to Sergius, he formally
 “taught the contrary. I have the whole passage
 “before me, but I will not cite it. . . . They
 “clearly show that the VI. Œcumenical Council
 “did not dream of condemning Honorius as person-
 “ally guilty of heresy, but only as guilty of negli-
 “gence.”

Well, Monseigneur, I too have the whole passage before me, and in my memory likewise, but I shall cite it. It is as follows :

The VI. Council says—“Anathema to the heretic Honorius.” Therefore the VI. Council condemns Honorius as heretical.

The whole passage runs thus :

“ Anathema to the heretic Theodore ! Anathema
 “ to the heretic Cyrus ! Anathema to the heretic
 “ Honorius ! Anathema to the heretic Pyrrhus ! ”
 “ Theodoro hæretico, anathema ! Sergio hæretico,
 “ anathema ! Cyro hæretico, anathema ! Honorio
 “ hæretico, anathema ! Pyrrho hæretico, anathe-
 “ ma ! ”¹ Anathema to the heretic Honorius ! Is
 this, Monseigneur, the passage which clearly proves
 that the VI. Council never dreamt of condemning
 Honorius as guilty of heresy ?

The Council says : “ I anathematize him as
 heretical.” You reply, “ It is not true. He is
 not heretical.”

The VI. Council says : “ We have, moreover, ex-
 “ pelled from the Holy Catholic Church, and anathe-
 “ matized Honorius, who was Pope of old Rome,
 “ because in his letters to Sergius we have recognized
 “ that in everything he has followed the same doctrine
 “ and confirmed his impious dogmas.” “ Cum his
 “ vero simul projici a sancta Dei catholica ecclesia,
 “ simulque anathematizari prævidimus, et Honorium,
 “ qui fuerat Papa antiquæ Romæ, eo quod invenimus
 “ per Scripta, quæ ab eo facta sunt ad Sergium,
 “ quia in omnibus ejus mentem secutus est, et impia
 “ dogmata confirmavit.”²

Is it evident, Monseigneur, that the Council by
 this expression, never dreamt of condemning Hono-

¹ Hardouin, Concil., v. iii. p. 1386.

² Hardouin, Concil., v. iii. p. 1334.

rius as heretical? It declares the doctrine impious, that of Sergius, and the same heretical, and for which Honorius, holding and confirming in everything the same impious doctrine, is condemned as heretical. And you reply to the Council that it is nothing of the kind: "Honorius, far from teaching "monothelism, has formally taught the contrary."

The VI. Council says: "We have caused to be "read the letter of Honorius to Sergius, and *have* "*found it altogether alien from the Apostolic teaching, "the definitions of Councils, the doctrine of the eminent "holy Fathers, and, that contrariwise, it follows the "false teachings of the heretics. We altogether "reject them and abhor them as soul-destroying."* "Similiter autem (retractantes) et epistolam ab illo, "id est, Honorio rescriptam ad eundem Sergium: "hasque invenientes omnino alienas existere ab "apostolicis dogmatibus, et a definitionibus sanct- "orum conciliorum, et cunctorum probabilium patrum, "sequi vero falsas doctrinas hæreticorum: eas omni- "modo abjicimus, et tanquam animæ noxias exse- "cramur."¹

"And these writings," says the Council again, "these profane and soul-destroying writings, we "have caused to be burnt before us, for their "complete annihilation." "Et prævidimus profana "et animæ pernicioso continuo ob perfectum exter- "minium igne concremari."²

¹ Hardouin, Concil., v. iii. p. 1331.

² Mans i, v. ix., p. 564.

Speaking thus, Monseigneur, the VI. Council, in your opinion, evidently could not have dreamt of condemning Honorius as heretical.

III. But this is not all. See how this condemnation of Honorius as heretical (*"Anathema Honorio hæretico"*), pronounced by the VI. Council, was confirmed by the VII. Œcumenical Council in the terms following: "We proclaim in our Lord two wills and two operations, and with the VI. Council we reject Sergius, Honorius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, and Macarius . . . and all those who follow their teaching." "Deinde quoque et duas voluntates et duas operationes secundum naturarum proprietatem in Christo prædicamus: quemadmodum Constantinopoli sexta Synodus exclamavit, abjiciens Sergium, Honorium, Cyrum, Pyrrhum, Macarium . . . atque istis similia sentientes."¹

The VII. Council says again: "We anathematize the madness of Arius and that of Macedonius . . . and the monothelism of Sergius, Honorius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, and all who believe with them." "Anathematizantes Arii vesaniam, Macedonii rabiem . . . Sergii, Honorii, et Cyri, et Pyrrhi, et assecclarum eorum unius, immo nequam moris, voluntatem."² The VII. Council, in its turn, here condemns Honorius as a monothelite; and you maintain, against the VII. Council, which confirms the VI.,

¹ Hardouin, Concil., v. iv., p. 454.

² Hardouin, Concil., v. xiv., p. 474.

“that Honorius, far from teaching monothelism, has formally taught the contrary.”

Does the VII. Œcumenical Council speak thus *en passant*? No, it speaks thus in its solemn conclusion, in its dogmatic decree, after reciting the Nicene Creed, and the anathema pronounced against all the heretics who have attacked this Creed.

Therefore, unless we reject the VI. and VII. Councils, we must admit that Honorius was condemned as heretical. But we find the VIII. Council imitating the VII., also in solemn conclusion, after reciting the Creed, in its dogmatic decree, saying, “We acknowledge the VI. Œcumenical Council, which affirms two wills, two operations in Jesus Christ; and with it we anathematize Theodore, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter, impious patriarchs of Constantinople, and together with them Honorius of Rome, Cyrus of Alexandria, and Macarius of Antioch, *followers of the impious doctrines of those heresiarchs Apollinarius and Eutyches.*” “Sanctam et universalem Synodum suscipientes, quæ in unius Christi duabus naturis consequenter etiam duas operationes ac totidem voluntates sapienter asseruit. Anathematizamus autem Theodorum, qui fuit episcopus Pharan, et Sergium, et Pyrrhum, et Paulum, et Petrum, impios præsules Constantinopolitanorum Ecclesiæ, atque cum eis Honorium Romæ, una cum Cyro Alexandriæ, nec non et Macarium Antiochiæ . . . qui malæ opinionis Apollinarii et Eutychetis impiorum hæresiarcharum

“dogmata sectantes.”¹ Therefore the VIII. Council decrees that Honorius is condemned *as a follower of the impious doctrines of monothelite heresiarchs*; and against the VIII. Council, as against the two preceding ones, you maintain that Honorius is not a follower of these heresiarchs, since he formally teaches the contrary.

Does it still seem to you, Monseigneur, that these three Councils never thought of condemning Honorius as heretical, and that that is clear? Do you still maintain, against these three Councils, “that Honorius has never taught monothelism, but “has formally taught the contrary?”

Do you maintain that three Œcumenical Councils were mistaken, but that Honorius was not mistaken? And do you still blame Mgr. d’Orléans for having had the courage to recall these questions, *already decided*?

In very truth, they have been decided; but you see now in what sense. Only you do not yet know all the judges nor all the witnesses.

The other judges and the other witnesses are these:—

IV. First, the authority of the Popes.

Pope Adrian II. declares that Pope Honorius was accused of heresy: “Qui super hæresi fuerat accusatus.”²

¹ Hardouin, Concil., b. v., p. 914.

² Mansi, Ampl. Coll., xvi., 126.

Listen to Pope S. Leo II., in his official account to the Emperor. "We anathematize alike those "inventors of new error, Theodore, Bishop of "Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus, "Paul, Peter, plotters against, rather than prelates "of the Church of Constantinople; *and also* "Honorius, who did not illumine this apostolical "Church with the doctrine of apostolic tradition, "but, by a foul betrayal, attempted to subvert its "spotless faith." "Pariter anathematizamus novi "erroris inventores, id est, Theodorum, Pharanitanum Episcopum, Cyrum Alexandrinum, Sergium, "Pyrrhum, Paulum, Petrum, Constantinopolitanæ "ecclesiæ subcessores magis quam præules; nec "non Honorium, qui hanc apostolicam Ecclesiam "non apostolicæ traditionis doctrina lustravit, sed "profana proditione immaculatam fidem subvertere "conatus est."¹

I hasten to add that this Latin text appears to be translated from the Greek, which differs from the Latin in one word. Instead of the word *conatus est*, the Greek has *παρεχώρησε*, which means *has permitted, has given opportunity for*.

Whatever it may be—whether to attempt by a foul sacrilege to subvert the faith, or only by a foul sacrilege has given opportunity for subverting the faith—this is no mere negligence, but heresy—active, effective, and guilty. This passage of Saint Leo is then far from proving that they never thought of

¹ Héfélé, *Hist. des Concil.*, v. iii., p. 267.

condemning Honorius as guilty of heresy, but only as guilty of negligence. It is quite true that the same Pope, Leo II., writing to the Spanish Bishops, uses the word "negligence." But let us see whether this second text contradicts the first. "All those who, as traitors against the purity of apostolic tradition, have been condemned with eternal condemnation, namely, Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus, Sergius, as well as Honorius, who did not, as befitted apostolic authority, quench the flame of heresy, but, by neglecting, cherished it." "Qui vero adversum apostolicæ traditionis puritatem perduelliones extiterant, abeuntes quidem æterna condemnatione mulctati sunt, id est, Theodorus Pharanitanus, Cyrus Alexandrinus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paulus, Petrus, Constantinopolitani, cum Honorio, qui flammam hæretici dogmatis non, ut decuit apostolicam auctoritatem, incipientem extinxit, sed negligendo confovit."¹ To neglect the fire which breaks out in the very centre of the faith, to fail in the duty of his office, to prove himself thus a traitor against the purity of tradition, and consequently to merit an eternal condemnation, is not merely an act of negligence.

The same Pope writes to King Erwiga: "All the authors of this impious doctrine, condemned by the sentence of the venerable Council, have been rejected from Catholic unity, namely, Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Sergius, Paulus,

¹ Hardouin, Concil., iii., 1730.

“ Pyrrhus, Peter, former Bishops of Constantinople,
 “ and together with them Honorius of Rome, who
 “ consented that the immaculate faith, which he had
 “ received from his predecessors, should be defiled.”
 “ Omnesque hæreticæ assertionis auctores, venerando
 “ censente Concilio, condemnati, de Catholicæ ecclesiæ
 “ adunatione projecti sunt, id est, Theodorus, Pharani-
 “ tanus Episcopus, Cyrus Alexandrinus, Sergius,
 “ Paulus, Pyrrhus, et Petrus, quondam Constanti-
 “ nopolitani præsules, et una cum eis Honorius
 “ Romanus, qui immaculatam apostolicæ traditionis
 “ regulam quam a prædecessoribus suis suscepit,
 “ maculari consentit.”¹

You see, Monseigneur, the cause is fully decided. Unless you reject three Œcumenical Councils and the declaration of the Popes, you see that Pope Honorius was condemned for heresy.

V. But what is to be said with regard to the traditional and solemn condemnation which, for ages past, the Popes, in their solemn Profession of faith on the day of their election, have constantly repeated on the subject of the heresy of Honorius? I have before me these Professions of faith of the sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries, and there I find these words:—

“ We profess the doctrine of the Fathers of the
 “ VI. Œcumenical Council . . who bound by the bond
 “ of a perpetual anathema . . . the authors of that

¹ Héfélé, *Hist. des Concil.*, v. iii., p. 267.

“ new heretical dogma, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and
 “ Peter, of Constantinople, together with Honorius,
 “ who fomented their perverse assertions.” “ Etiam
 “ sanctum sextum Concilium Universale prædicamus
 “ . . . qui auctores novi hæretici dogmatis, Sergium,
 “ Pyrrhum, Paulum, et Petrum, Constantinopoli-
 “ tanos, una cum Honorio, qui pravis eorum asser-
 “ tionibus fomentum impendit . . . nexu perpetui
 “ anathematis devinxerunt.”¹

But we have yet another witness. All the Roman Breviaries, until the 16th century, mentioned the condemnation of Honorius. I have before me a Roman Breviary of 1520, printed at Turin, in which, on the feast of S. Leo, June 28th, I find the condemnation of Honorius.²

“ In which synod were condemned Sergius, Cyrus,
 “ Honorius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter, also Macarius,
 “ with his disciple Stephen, and Polichronius, and
 “ Simon, who asserted and proclaimed one will and
 “ operation in our Lord Jesus Christ.” “ In qua
 “ synodo condemnati sunt Sergius, Cyrus, Honorius,
 “ Pyrrhus, Paulus, et Petrus, nec non et Macarius,
 “ cum discipulo suo Stephano, sed et Polichronius et
 “ Simon, qui unam voluntatem et operationem in
 “ Domino Jesu Christo dixerunt vel prædicaverunt.”

This passage is especially remarkable. I have it before me, and transcribe it fully and consecutively,

¹ P. Garnier, *Liber diurnus*, p. 41.

Brev. Rom. de 1520, inscrit à la Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, B B 38, imprimé à Turin en cette année 1520.

without omitting a word. It simply declares that Honorius, like the rest, was condemned by the VI. Council for having taught the unity of operation and will in Jesus Christ—that is to say, the heresy of monothelism.

In this there is nothing to dispute. Now, this same condemnation appears in all the Roman Breviaries until the reformation of Clement VIII., at the beginning of the 17th century. In the libraries at Paris, the Imperial library, and that of S. Geneviève, I have examined a large number of Roman Breviaries prior to the 16th century, and in all of them I found this condemnation of Honorius.

Frankly, Monseigneur, is not all this three or four times decisive, and is it not truly scandalous that, in the presence of such a mass of facts, persons should continue to dispute them ?

How can this marvel be explained ? It can only be explained by what I have already said at the beginning of this letter. There is at the present day a school of error, founded upon passion, blindness, and hot-headedness—a school seeing nothing and listening to nothing, prepared to deny everything and to affirm everything in the sense in which it is itself hurried along. Behold its mode of action !

Both historians and theologians have proclaimed this fact : That Pope Honorius was condemned for heresy by three Œcumenical Councils approved of by the Popes, by two Roman Councils presided over by Popes, and by the pontifical Profession of faith in

force during several centuries. The facts are before the eyes of the world; the passages are everywhere; there is nothing, it seems, to dispute.

At this very moment, upon the simple statement of this proposition, that a Pope was condemned for heresy, the school, which believes its mission to be the protection of the Papacy, refuses to listen, refuses to examine, and rushes headlong to defend Honorius. It overthrows everything which seems to witness against him; and, braving every threat of excommunication, it tramples under foot three Councils and five Popes, without reckoning the ancient Profession of pontifical faith. "No," say they, "he was never heretical; for, far from teaching monothelism, he has formally taught the contrary. Heretical he could not be, for his own letters remain to prove the orthodoxy of his teaching." And, in this mad conflict, the thought does not even strike them that, if the letters of Honorius are not heretical, the whole Church has for centuries anathematized as heretical a writing, a man, a Pope, perfectly orthodox; and that, on a question of faith and dogmatic facts, three Councils and twenty Popes have obstinately deceived themselves in their most solemn decrees. They do not see that, in order to save one Pope, they sacrifice twenty, without reckoning three general Councils, whose decrees they trample under foot!

I affirm then, that in this there is neither science, reason, argument, regard, nor any intellectual oper-

ation whatever. It is a species of vertigo, of intoxication unable to discern the objects before it.

But then, how does it happen that minds of the highest excellence, such as some of those which I have seen, are carried away by the torrent? It arises from this fact, that everyone, without exception, may deceive himself and, above all, may be deceived. It arises from this fact, that a school of error exists, which makes use, without knowing it, of a long tradition of falsehood and fraud—a school which, by a material fraud, has already deceived thousands of minds, S. Thomas Aquinas amongst others, and which is able, now again at this present day, to deceive the most intelligent and especially the purest minds, which are incapable of suspecting a fraud and believing a falsehood.

I shall speak presently of these falsehoods and these frauds, but first I must return to that which concerns Honorius.

VI. Here let me add a summary of the details of the great fact of Honorius, so that this question may be, in the sight of everyone, a question decided.

1. Before the 16th century no one ever denied that Honorius was condemned by the VI. Council.¹ Before that century no one ever uttered a doubt of the authenticity of the acts of the VI. Council, or

¹ The main part of this summary I have borrowed from a dissertation in Latin by Father Garnier, editor of the *Liber Diurnus*, a dissertation which remained unpublished until now, and which M. de Rosière has just given to the world in his supplement to the *Liber Diurnus*.

that of the letters of Constantine or those of Leo II. Since the 16th century no one has ever cleared from dust the smallest monument raised in favour of Honorius.

2. In 1608 the collection of general Councils was printed at Rome, by order of Paul V. Amongst the acts of the VI. council, session XIII., subscribed by the legates of the Apostolic See, is found the condemnation of Honorius, "Projici a sancta Dei
"Catholica ecclesia, simulque anathematizari Hono-
"rium;" and in session XVI. we find, "Honorio
"hæretico anathema."

3. In session XVIII. the dogmatic decree signed by Constantine is recorded. Anathema is there pronounced against the heretic Honorius in these terms: "Sergio et Honorio anathema."

4. After which the Fathers address to the Emperor the final declaration, in which the anathema against Honorius again appears. "Et cum his Honorium,
"qui fuit Romæ præsul, utpote qui eos in his secutus
"est."

5. The Fathers write to Pope Agatho, and mention Honorius amongst the Bishops condemned. "Anathematibus interfecimus. . . Sergium, Hono-
"rium, Cyrum."

6. Constantine accepts the Council by an edict in which is mentioned Honorius, who was Pope, and who confirmed the heresy. "Honorius, qui fuit
"antiquæ Romæ Papa, hujus modi hæreseos con-
"firmator."

7. The Emperor adds to this some letters to Leo II., declaring his acceptance of the Council. Leo II. replies to the Emperor, and in his letter anathematizes Honorius, as having by a profane betrayal (“*profanâ proditione*”) suffered the immaculate Church Apostolic to be defiled.

8. Yves de Chartres mentions these letters of Leo II. in his *Décret*, part IV.

9. Leo II. wrote three letters to Spain. In all three of them, he mentions the condemnation of Honorius: “*Qui flammam hæretici dogmatis incipientem non extinxit, sed negligendo confovit.*”

10. The same Pope wrote besides to Erwiga, King of Spain, and describes Honorius as having been condemned “for having consented that the rule of faith should be defiled.”

11. The XVI. Council of Toledo gives an abstract of these letters in chapters I. and II.

12. The acts of the VII. Œcumenical Council four times recount the condemnation of Honorius. At the end, in its dogmatic decree, it pronounces anathema against the heretic Honorius.

13. The VIII. general Council, in its dogmatic decree, anathematizes Honorius. “*Anathematizamus Honorium Romæ.*”

14. Venerable Bede (*the historian*), almost a contemporary of the VI. Council, relates that Honorius was condemned by this Council.

15. The *Liber Diurnus*, in the Profession of faith made by the newly-elected Popes, shows us that each time Honorius was condemned by it afresh.

16. The *Liber Pontificalis*, in reference to Saint Leo II., agrees with the *Liber Diurnus*, and describes Honorius as condemned by the VI. Council.

17. From the *Liber Pontificalis* are extracted, word for word, for the Roman Breviary, two instructions for the Office of Pope Leo II., in which Honorius appears amongst the heretics condemned by the VI. Council.

18. Yves de Chartres, in his *Décret*, part IV., has extracted from the *Liber Pontificalis* the passage relating to the condemnation of Honorius.

19. Pope Adrian I. approves of the acts of the VII. Council and the definitions of faith, which he honours with the name of creed, and in which appears again the condemnation of Honorius.

20. Cardinal Humbert, speaking, in a polemical work, of the VI. Council, mentions the condemnation of Honorius.

21. Anastasius the Librarian, himself a determined defender of Honorius, writes however, that the VI. Council pronounced anathema against Honorius as heretical. "Licet huic sexta sancta Synodus
"quasi hæretico anathema dixerit et in Dei solius
"judicio jam positum reprobationis telo confoderit."

22. Hincmar, contemporary of Anastasius, in his tract upon the Holy Trinity, says that Pope Honorius was condemned by the VI. Council for "his opinions

“contrary to the faith and his guilty assent with
“the heretics.”

23. As to the Greek writers, it would be difficult, as well as superfluous, to enumerate all those who speak of the condemnation of Honorius by the VI. Council, *e.g.*, the Deacon Agatho, Secretary of the Council; Tarasius, who was the life of the VII. Council; Theodore of Jerusalem, author of the *Liber Synodicus*; Nilus, who wrote upon the creeds. . . . It needs not to speak of the others.

The result of all this, Monseigneur, is that the cause is indeed decided, and that upon this point there can no longer be the least doubt.

Pope Honorius, having been consulted as Pope by three Eastern Patriarchs—that is, by the whole Eastern Church—upon a question of faith, replied to this application. Consequently he replied in the exercise of the highest duty which he possessed—that of confirming his brethren in the faith.

The Pope replied by two famous letters, which, for more than half a century, were the strongest support of monothelism. It is this fact which explains the vigour and determination with which both Councils and Popes condemned these letters and their author. These letters were burnt in the VI. Council, and condemned as heretical by three successive Œcumenical Councils, and, for several centuries, by all the Popes in their solemn Profession of faith on the day of their installation. Have not some persons had the temerity to say that these letters were only

private letters, and not dogmatic writings at all? This cannot be meant seriously. The Council decides otherwise. "These dogmatic writings must be brought before us . . . the copies of the dogmatic letters . . . treating of the present dogmatic question. . . We have read a second time these dogmatic letters, which the aforesaid persons wrote dogmatically to us." "Oportet ad nos adferri regesta ac dogmatica scripta . . . facta super præsentì dogmatica quæstione. . . Retractantes dogmaticas epistolas, quæ a supradictis personis dogmatice scripta sunt. . . Exemplaria dogmaticarum epistolarum."¹

"They wish it to appear," says Cardinal la Luzerne, "that he wrote, not as Pope, but as a private person. But these letters are replies. . . Will they say that it was to the individual named Honorius, and not to the Pope, that Sergius wrote? Will they say it was to his person, and not to his pontifical authority, that S. Sophronius sent deputies? Will they say that it was as a private person, and not as Pope, that he commanded silence? It is as Pope that he wrote, as Pope that he erred."²

"THESE THINGS YOU WILL PREACH WITH US," "HÆC NOBISCUM FRATERNITAS VESTRA PRÆDICET," wrote Pope Honorius to Sergius. Honorius gave to his letters all the force, all the solemnity that a Pope could give to them, at that time when it was the custom

¹ Mansi, XI., p. 543, 554, 558, 578.

² Sur la declaration, p. 358.

to reply to Churches which consulted the Roman Church, but when the apostolical epistles never explicitly declared the intention of addressing the whole Church—an intention, moreover, which has no need to be expressed, when a declaration is made upon a dogmatic question. Besides which, it is entirely beyond dispute that at this epoch the Popes, the Œcumenical Councils, the whole Church had not the smallest doubt of the competency of Councils to condemn a Pope as heretical, in his dogmatic letters destined to determine the dogmatic teaching of the whole Eastern Church.

VII. The facts being thus and entirely beyond dispute, you will imagine, Monseigneur, the astonishment, which I must have felt, when I read those words of yours which I here repeat: “I have the whole passage before me . . . which clearly shows that the VI. Œcumenical Council never dreamt of condemning Honorius as guilty of heresy, but only as guilty of negligence.”

Now it is, Monseigneur, that I have the right to say to you, that which you had not the right to say to the Bishop of Orleans, “Yes, Monseigneur, you were mistaken.” No, the Bishop of Orleans was not mistaken in any way. You, Monseigneur, in your letter to the Bishop of Orleans, you were mistaken on every point, or rather you have been deceived by a mass of false documents.

Yes, you have been deceived by a grand collection of false assertions—the fruit of great ignorance and mediocre sincerity—which, for some time past, have been current upon this subject. There is a certain mode of Apologetics, a certain polemical spirit, which is certainly not the offspring of our time, and which Holy Scripture, in the Old Testament, has already branded with these divine and terrible words, very necessary to meditate upon: “Has God then
 “need of your falsehoods, that ye speak deceitfully
 “for Him?” “Numquid indiget Deus mendacio
 “vestro, ut pro Eo loquamini dolos?”¹

This hard speech is addressed by Job to his friends, who endeavour to justify Providence by false arguments. Are then these friends of Job scoundrels, forgers, shameless liars? No, they are simply men, such, for the most part, as most men are; all, or almost all of whom, when they believe they are supporting a good cause, defend it by every means in their power—heap up false arguments, the emptiness of which they themselves are aware of; conceal facts which embarrass them; and adduce uncertain facts, which, even as they proclaim them, they doubt. Now, it is this first degree of dishonesty that the Holy Spirit brands with, or rather crushes with, this reproach: “Has God need of your deceit and your falsehoods?”

But, in all intellectual strifes, mingled amid those that are blind and those that are carried away by passion, there are also the liars and the cheats.

¹ Job xiii. 7 (Vulg.)

Now, here is a remarkable instance of what the cheats are capable of.

How, in the last reformation of the Roman Breviary, could the scribe appointed to this duty have taken the liberty, on this very question of Honorius, to mutilate the instruction of S. Leo for the 28th of June, as he has done? I have quoted above the exact passage of the Breviary of 1520, which runs thus: "In this Synod were condemned Cyrus, Sergius, Honorius, Pyrrhus . . . who affirmed or preached one operation or will in our Lord Jesus Christ." "In qua Synodo condemnati sunt Cyrus, Sergius, Honorius, Pyrrhus . . . qui unam voluntatem et operationem in Domino Jesu Christo dixerunt vel prædicaverunt." I open the Roman Breviary of to-day, and there I find, in the instruction of S. Leo (June 28th): "In this Synod were condemned Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, who admitted only one operation or will in Jesus Christ." "In eo Concilio Cyrus, Sergius, et Pyrrhus condemnati sunt, uam tantummodo voluntatem et operationem in Christo prædicantes." The name of Honorius has disappeared. They have simply suppressed the condemnation of Honorius. Father Garnier, in the preface to his edition of the *Liber Diurnus* (1680), says, with a gentle irony, that they did so for the sake of brevity: "Nunc aliter ista, breviusque leguntur."

Thus the ancient Breviary, which I have just quoted, gives the names of the heretics condemned

by the VI. Council, and defines the heresy for which they were condemned. Honorius is amongst the number. The scribe who had to correct the Breviary does away altogether, for the sake of brevity, with this trifling incident of a Pope condemned for heresy by an Œcumenical Council. Are such falsifications as these to be tolerated? This, Monseigneur, is one of the frauds which deceived you. Here are some others, of the same class, always perpetrated with the same intention and to attain the same end—an undivided supremacy.

VIII. I have before me this same Roman Breviary of the 16th century (1520), and in it I read, on the feast of S. Marcel, January 16th, the long account of the wonderful martyrdom of this holy Pope. But, in the reformed Breviary, I find an interpolation, not a word of which the ancient Roman Breviaries contain. It is as follows: “Saint Marcel wrote a letter to the
 “ Bishops of the province of Antioch, touching the
 “ primacy of the Roman Church, which he shows
 “ ought to be called the Head of the Churches.
 “ In this, moreover, it is declared that no Council
 “ can be legally convoked, except by the authority
 “ of the Roman Pontiff.” “*Scriptis epistolam ad*
 “ *Episcopos Antiochenæ provinciæ, de primatu*
 “ *Romanæ Ecclesiæ, quam Caput Ecclesiarum appell-*
 “ *andum demonstrat. Ubi etiam illud scriptum est,*
 “ *nullum Concilium jure celebrari, nisi ex auctoritate*
 “ *Romani Pontificis.*”

Now, what is this letter of which mention is made here? It is a document forged in the 9th century, a false decretal.¹ It is, then, towards the beginning of the 17th century that they have interpolated the ancient Liturgy with frauds like the false decretals, already suspected of being false by the great Cardinal de Cusa in the 15th century, proved to be such from the middle of the 16th, and cast aside henceforth with indignation by Cardinal Baronius.

I do not intend to maintain that everything taken from the false decretals must necessarily be a doctrinal error; but I maintain that it is testimony borrowed from falsehood, and which, without better evidence, renders the doctrine which it supports an object of suspicion.

A second interpolation. On the feast of S. Marcellin, April 26th, the ancient Roman Breviary of 1520 confines itself to the recital of the martyrdom of this Pope. But here is another Roman Breviary of 1536,² and another of 1542,³ in which the odious and ridiculous fable of the pretended Council of Sinuessa is introduced.⁴ The Pope, S. Marcellin, at that Council had accused himself of offering incense to idols, and the Breviary simply adds, "*Cæterum a nemine damnatus est.*" But, half a century later, the fable of Sinuessa expanded as follows: "No one,

¹ Hinschius, v. i., p. 223 and following.

² Bibl. Sainte-Geneviève, Num. B B 70.

³ Ibid, Num. B B 67.

⁴ Héfélé, Hist. des Concil., v. iii., ch. iii.—On the pretended Synod of Sinuessa.

“ however, *dared* to condemn him, but all with one voice cried out, ‘ Judge yourself, by your own mouth, but not by our judgment; for the first See can be judged by no one.’ ” “ *Quem tamen damnare ausus est nemo, sed omnes una voce clamant, ‘ Tuo te ore, non nostro iudicio, iudica; nam prima Sedes a nemine iudicatur.’* ” Thus the famous, though now trite, axiom, *prima Sedes a nemine iudicatur*, is taken from this absurd legend. Now, with regard to one of these frauds, with regard to the expunging a most important word in the ancient Roman Liturgy, Cardinal Bellarmine is bold enough to say that the change was made by the inspiration of God.¹ If this doctrine of *inspiration a posteriori*, applied to the rehandling of books and history, be adopted, who will prevent its application to the Gospel? They might actually change the Gospel.

IX. Yes, these are the falsehoods by which they think to serve God. Wherefore I am bold to repeat my text: “ Has God then need of your falsehoods, that you speak deceitfully for Him? ” “ *Numquid indiget Deus mendacio vestro, ut pro Eo loquamini dolos?* ”

This mode of Apologetics without openness is one of the causes of our religious decay for centuries past. As soon as human nature perceives in the Apostle the smallest trace of craft or duplicity, it

¹ Bellarmin, Resp. ad Epist. de Monitorio contra Venetos.—Respons. ad tertiam propositionem.

turns aside and takes to flight; the best always flee farther than the rest. Their souls do not listen to the voice of liars. “Oves non audiunt vocem alienorum.”

What, then, are we—we Catholic priests, ministers of Jesus Christ and of His Gospel, and servants of His Church?

Are we the preachers of falsehood, or the Apostles of truth? Is not every truth, every true gift, every historical and real fact for us, just as every falsehood is against us?

Has not the time arrived—in this age of publicity, in which everything is seen and brought to light, in which everything that before was spoken in the ear, is now preached upon the house-tops—has not the time arrived, I repeat, to reject with disgust the frauds, the interpolations and mutilations which liars and forgers, our most cruel enemies, have been able to introduce amongst us?

There are, says Holy Scripture, two kinds of men—“men of truth and men of falsehood,” “viri veraces et viri mendaces.”¹ This is the chief distinction of races. The first, the men of light, cannot understand the second. They do not conceive a falsehood; they do not believe in it. Such are you, Monseigneur, in your superiority of intelligence, of heart, of goodness, of absolute sincerity. Man of light, you cannot understand this darkness, and you

¹ Eccles. xv.

do not believe in it. This is why, more than others, you may become its victim.

I myself was long before I could believe in this apologetics of ignorance, blindness, and half-honesty, or rather dishonesty, which desires the end, which believes in the goodness of its aim and its truth; but which, to attain this end, has recourse to deceit, to mystery, to force, to falsehood, to a fraudulent invention of forged passages. Once more, Has God need of these frauds?

This, I say, this is what I could not believe; but have I, perhaps, not been able to be enlightened by facts as these persons have. For instance, an Italian prelate made to myself, with respect to Galileo, the following declaration: "Yes, undoubtedly," said he, "Galileo was right, and his judges knew perhaps that he was right, that he had discovered the true laws of astronomy: but, at that time, this too dangerous truth would have scandalised the faithful. This is the reason they condemned him, and they did right." It was to myself that these words were uttered. But what!—is it not in print? This is not the opinion of one only: read in the history of Galileo¹ the opinion of three apologists, who maintain "that prudence directed Popes Paul V. and Urban VIII.² and the Roman congregations to condemn, in the name of Holy Scripture and the

¹ Th. Henri Martin, *Galilée*, p. 272.

² It appears that the Popes never signed the condemnation of Galileo, and that the judges of the Holy Office are alone responsible for it. V. Henri Martin, *Ibid.*

“Catholic faith, a system true indeed, but opposed
 “to the received interpretation of certain sacred
 “texts.”

Had, then, the Catholic faith—had the Word of God need of this monstrous imposture in a solemn judgment? O ye men of little faith, of low minds, of miserable hearts, have not your cunning devices become the scandal of souls? The very day that the grand science of nature dawned upon the world, you condemned it. Be not astonished if men, before pardoning you, expect of you a confession, penitence, profound contrition, and reparation for your fault.

Have not others too, on the same subject, dared to say, as certain English Catholics have done, that the system of Copernicus or Galileo was false in the 17th century, but true and orthodox in the 19th, for the simple reason that the Church now authorises it? But what service, once more, do they imagine they are rendering to God, or what glory to Christ, by these impudent assertions?

X. Here is another fact which ought to have enlightened me still further. On one occasion it was my duty, as professor and examiner of the Sorbonne, to cause to be struck out of a thesis upon the false decretals the following remarks, which a theological candidate submitted to the Faculty: “The charge of *an odious fraud*, which, since the
 “16th century, has been freely applied to it, may
 “unquestionably be removed from the work of the

“ pseudo-Isidore, and the work itself be proved to
 “ be nothing more on the part of its author, as
 “ Mohler has already remarked, than a *pious fraud*—
 “ *fraus pia.*”

A second remark. “All seemed lost. . . Then
 “ arises a canonist no less zealous than skilful and
 “ clever, invokes ancient and holy Popes, recalls
 “ the famous Councils of primitive times, and, as
 “ there no longer existed written documents of these
 “ ancient Fathers, of these early Councils, he forges
 “ subsequent acts, which he ascribes to these per-
 “ sonages and to these assemblies whose names bore
 “ authority; and his book produced more effect
 “ upon his agitated generation than all the apostol-
 “ ical decrees.”

“A little careful study puts to flight, then, all the
 “ attacks which, for a long time past, have been
 “ directed either against the pseudo-Isidore himself,
 “ or against the doctrines contained in his collection.
 “ . . . If he affirm that his aim was to offer to the
 “ public a useful work—which in reality he did—by
 “ reconstructing ecclesiastical legislation in a manner,
 “ artificial we admit, but sound at bottom.”

And the thesis concludes thus: “Accordingly, to
 “ sum up what we have said, the false decretals,
 “ against which so great an agitation arose, do not
 “ deserve all the anathemas which a certain school¹
 “ has unceasingly hurled against them. Undoubtedly

¹ Undoubtedly the liberal Catholics are meant here.

“ the pseudo-Isidore was wrong as regards the fact
 “ of his suppositions ; but he may easily be justified
 “ by his intentions, which were excellent. The false
 “ decretals brought in no innovations, either in the
 “ government or discipline of the Church ; they
 “ simply stated the right and customs in force at
 “ every period, and it is impossible not to recognize
 “ the happy influence which they exercised at that
 “ the most disastrous epoch of the Church.”

I prefer the noble judgment of Father de Reynon, who frankly says as follows : “ Never, we must
 “ admit, has the world beheld a falsehood so
 “ audacious, so immense, so solemn, so persevering,
 “ and, let us add, during centuries so triumphant.
 “ Yes, the impostor attained his end. He has
 “ changed, as he wished, the discipline of the Church ;
 “ but he has not stayed the general decay. God
 “ never blesses imposture. The false decretals have
 “ never produced ought but harm.”¹

XI. I have spoken of the *Liber Diurnus*, which contains the ancient Profession of faith of the Popes. The history of this book is still well fitted to enlighten us upon the existence of the Apologetics of dishonesty or half good-faith—that poisoned source of our present divisions. Read the account of the extraordinary efforts, which were made at Rome and elsewhere, in the 17th century, to suppress this book,

¹ *Etudes religieuses*, November, 1866.—(See also November, 1864.)

which revealed so much, and to stay its publication. Why all these efforts? Because they wished to conceal from the world the Profession of faith of the former Popes, who, for centuries past, on the day of their accession, renewed the condemnation of Honorius—a condemnation which is, and ever will be, the eternal obstacle to the doctrine of a personal, absolute, separate infallibility.

Father Sirmonel, possessor of one of the manuscripts of the *Liber Diurnus*, and Cardinal Bona, Referee of the Index, simply avow their motive.

Father Sirmonel writes: "The Profession of faith of the newly-elected Pope stamps with reprobation, in the ancient formulary of the Roman Church, the memory of Honorius." "It is this reason," he adds, "which has deterred me from publishing this formulary, in spite of the promise which I made to Cardinal Sainte-Suzanne."¹

Cardinal Bona says: "As Pope Honorius is condemned in the Profession of faith of the new Pontiffs . . . it is better not to publish this work." "Cum in Professione fidei electi Pontificis damnetur Honorius Papa . . . præstat non divulgari opus."²

Father Sirmonel and Cardinal Bona simply then admit it. This is the natural descent of the human misery which they follow. Each one defends himself as he can. Behold a fact which overwhelms us! Let us prevent its being known.

¹ De Rosière. Introduction to the *Liber Diurnus*, p. 114.

² De Rosière. *Ibid.*, p. 113.

XII. You see it, then, by these facts and these admissions, for centuries past the school of dissimulation, deceit, and falsehood endeavours to suppress the too revealing history of Pope Honorius. They mutilate the Breviary, the ancient Roman Breviary, which, from the 7th to the 16th century, contained in set terms, in terms beyond dispute, the condemnation of Honorius as a monothelite heretic. They suppress the *Liber Diurnus*, which contains the same condemnation. They impel, by all the means in their power, the minds of men in this direction; so that now the popular historians of the Councils sum up the history of Honorius thus: “Sixth Œcumenical Council, with regard to which the name of the “holy Pope Honorius was for a moment compromised.”

After this we come to a veritable prodigy, as follows: In the Roman Breviary, in the offices *pro clero Romano*, they give the history of the VI. Council and of Pope Agatho, without mentioning the name of Honorius, or anything of that which alludes to him.

Open the Breviary at the office of S. Agatho, January 14th, and you will read as follows:—

“Agatho sent his legates and those of the Roman Council to Constantinople, with two letters to the Emperor, in which the heresy of the monothelites was learnedly, soundly, and lengthily refuted, and in which the chief authors and followers of this heresy—namely, Sergius, Cyrus, Paulus, Pyrrhus,

“and the others—were condemned. He declared at
 “the same time, in express terms, that his prede-
 “cessors had always been free from every stain of
 “error. By the authority, therefore, of Saint
 “Agatho was the VI. Œcumenical Council convoked,
 “which condemned the same errors and the same
 “persons that Agatho had condemned.” “Agatho
 “legatos suos et Concilii Romani misit Constantino-
 “polim, cum binis litteris ad Imperatorem, in quibus
 “prædicta hæresi (monothelitorum) docte, fuse, ac
 “solide refutata, damnatisque primariis illius secta-
 “toribus—Sergio scilicet, Cyro, Paulo, Pyrrho,
 “Petro, et aliis—antecessores suos ab omni erroris
 “labe immunes hucusque fuisse expressis verbis
 “declaravit. Agathonis, igitur, auctoritate Sexta
 “Synodus Universalis congregata est, in qua iidem
 “errores iidemque errantes damnati fuerunt.”

Such is then the account, lying and intolerable,
 which is given us—I know not by whom—of the
 history of the VI. Council. Never was there in
 history a more audacious forgery, a more insolent
 suppression of the weightiest facts.

Supposing the Fathers of the present Council
 should be called upon to vote upon the question of
 Infallibility, many, perhaps, would receive it because
 their Breviary, summing up a long succession of
 frauds in a last and solemn falsehood, has deceived
 them upon the fact of Pope Honorius, condemned by
 the VI. Council as heretical.

But will the falsehood be any advantage to God,

to the Church, to the Papacy? Neither the Papacy, nor the Church, nor God have desired the falsehood. “*Numquid indiget Deus mendacio vestro?*”

I ask you, Monseigneur, in the name of God, of our Lord Jesus Christ, and His Church, to pour out upon these infamies the indignation of your noble heart. I ask you to denounce them to our Father, Pope Pius IX., who, himself also a man of light, does not believe in falsehood, but who, seeing it with his own eyes, will be able to reject it. Meanwhile, to all my brethren in the priesthood, to all men of good faith, to all men of honour throughout the whole world, I denounce these frauds with indignation.

The single fact of systematic falsifications of the Roman Breviary, always under the pretence of absolute sovereignty and separate infallibility, this fact alone—and there are others—is sufficient to prevent us from proclaiming before God and man, in the face of good faith and honour, anything under this pretence, already too suspected, because it has falsehood as its ally. At least we must wait, and not blindly go forward in the midst of these snares. We must wait until full light shall have dawned upon all these things in the sight of all.

Now this, Monseigneur, this is why the Bishop of Orleans has spoken. From God he will receive his reward. And all those who, notwithstanding these arguments and these facts, are bold enough to go further and pronounce judgment in the dark, will

have to render an account to the tribunal of God. Absolute certainty here is necessary ; for the smallest doubt here, demands, by divine right, the most rigorous forbearance. As for myself, I believe most firmly that I am writing this by the ordonnance of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ, and for love of His Church. The lowest of men may and do receive the ordonnance of God. This I have received in my reason, my conscience, and my faith. To obey I am ready to suffer all that behoves me to suffer.

MGR. THE BISHOP OF ORLEANS,
AND
MGR. THE ARCHBISHOP OF MALINES.

SECOND LETTER
TO
MONSEIGNEUR DECHAMPS,
BY
A. GRATRY,

Prêtre de l'Oratoire, Membre de l'Académie Française.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH BY

T. J. BAILEY, B.A.,

Priest of the Church of England,

BY PERMISSION OF M. DOUNIOL, LIBRAIRE-EDITEUR,

29, RUE DE TOURNON, PARIS.

LONDON:

J. T. HAYES, LYALL PLACE.

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO., PATERNOSTER ROW.

BRIGHTON: G. WAKELING.

It is understood that this Letter, like all my other works, simply represents the opinion of the author, and does not bind the Oratoire in any way.

A. GRATRY,

Priest of the Oratoire,
Member of the Academy.

PARIS, FEBRUARY 3RD, 1870.

When this *Second Letter* was on the point of making its appearance, I received, by the newspapers of this date, the Letter of Mgr. Dechamps, promising me a reply at a period "when the labours of the Council shall leave him the leisure to do so." The words and tone of these pages exhibit towards myself nothing but forbearance, charity, goodness. The holy Bishop deigns still to call me his friend, and does not withdraw from me his affection. God be praised!

But, as to the theological question, Mgr. the Archbishop of Malines promises, on the question of Honorius, a triumphant reply upon five points, which he indicates.

Will he permit me to say, in my turn, that he will not keep this promise, because it is impossible to keep it? My *Second Letter* will increase, I believe, the impossibility—that is, if there are degrees of impossibility.

Will Mgr. the Archbishop of Malines allow me to correct my meaning upon two points in my *First Letter*?

I never imagined for a single instant that Mgr. Manning was really excommunicated. I said and I thought that "if we look at the matter literally and strictly, we should arrive at this "extraordinary conclusion," that Mgr. Manning would be excommunicate, as having contradicted the decrees of three Ecumenical Councils.

I have never imagined myself to have received from God any special mission. I said that "the lowest of men may and do receive orders from God." In this sense I have received them a thousand times, as we all have; and I have received them "in my reason, in my conscience, and in my faith." This does not mean that orders from God can be without clearness and force.

A. GRATRY,
Priest of the Oratoire.

SECOND LETTER TO MONSEIGNEUR THE
ARCHBISHOP OF MALINES.

MONSEIGNEUR,

A fortnight after the appearance of my First Letter, and a month after some journalists found, by chance, my proofs at my printer's, an obscure expression and two misprints were, in all fairness, pointed out to me in my Letter. All this has already been corrected, and I thus improve the new editions. If any one should do me the favour of finding other more important faults, I should be happy to correct them.

As to the shrill and fierce cries uttered by partisans on these occasions, it is my custom to utterly disregard them.

But one objection has moved me. "Yes," they say to me, "you praise MMgrs. Dechamps and Manning in the highest terms. You speak in your First Letter of grand intellectual nobility, of superiority of intelligence and goodness; and, nevertheless, in the course of the discussion, one does not perceive, in each of your pages, that tone of deep and tender respect, which we find in your discourses every time that these reverend Fathers are in question."

I am compelled to admit, Monseigneur, that the necessity of the argument has often carried me away, and has not permitted me to renew, as often as my heart desired, the expressions of my respect. But this, especially, is my excuse. It is not you, Monseigneur, with whom, in reality, I am fighting. Undoubtedly I have replied to a portion of your Letter. I shall reply to all the rest; but what I am fighting against is that *school of error* of which I have spoken—a school which aspires now to reign with individual authority, or which at least demands to be, like the great religious orders, subject to the jurisdiction of the Ordinary—that school, in fine, which for centuries past, and especially in this century, is the disgrace of our cause and the scourge of religion. This is our enemy, this is the enemy of the Church, which I, like every Christian and every theologian, have both the right and the duty of combating, especially during the continuance of the Council.

I repeat that there is a school of error, which has led away holy men and noble minds and numbers of the faithful. This school is not the offspring of our days, since it is it which, on certain points, deceived the genius and holiness of Saint Thomas Aquinas. In his case, as in others, impassioned, careless, and audacious minds carried away with them, by the force of assertion, regulated and modest minds. Next, liars in the Biblical sense—“*Numquid indiget Deus mendacio tuo?*”—appeared upon the scene.

Lastly, cheats, properly so called, forgers in public writings, were found here and there, in the course of centuries, supplying their abominable labour to the general tendency of the school. Now, I am speaking here only of frauds unmasked at this present time, and which no one can any longer defend.

There was, in the 9th century, a first fundamental falsehood, “ eminent, solemn, and triumphant for centuries,”¹ to use the words of Father de Regnon. That falsehood is the work of the false decretals. There was a second falsehood, in the 13th century, the work of another unknown forger, who introduced, in a collection of the texts of the Greek Fathers and the early Councils, forged passages, which he ascribes to certain Councils, to S. John Chrysostom, to S. Cyril.

These, Monseigneur, are the documents, materially false ones, upon which you have been working directly or indirectly, and which have deceived you.

I. In your letter, Monseigneur, to the Bishop of Orleans, there are three points to be discussed :—

1st. An argument upon the absolute sovereignty and personal infallibility of the Roman Pontiff.

2nd. The statement that the doctrine supported by your argument, the doctrine of personal infallibility, “ possesses the splendour of a positive truth—“ a truth admitted by the greatest names in theology “ in all ages.”

¹ *Études Religieuses*, November, 1866.

3rd. The denial or the explanation of the historical facts contrary to your argument.

In my First Letter I spoke only of the third point. My present Letter will enter upon the consideration of the second. My object will be to find out whether it is true, or how it is true that the doctrine of personal infallibility “possesses the splendour of a “positive truth—a truth admitted by the greatest “names in theology in all ages.”

Let us follow the order adopted by Mgr. Manning in his Charge upon the same subject; let us begin from modern times and ascend to the early ages.

I believe, Monseigneur, that for modern times you would accept as their representative the greatest names in theology—the names of Melchior Cano, of Bellarmine and S. Liguori.

It is understood that I shall speak neither of Bossuet, himself one of the great theological names of the later centuries, nor of Gerson, whose reputation was great enough for the *Imitation* to be attributed to him, nor of anything which concerns the noble and powerful school of the Sorbonne, nor even of Fénelon, who, upon the question of personal infallibility, refutes Bellarmine with the utmost decision.

Let us take first the case of Melchior Cano.

In a chapter upon the divine privileges of the Holy See and of the Pope in matters of Faith,¹

¹ De Locis Theologicis. Bk. vi., c. iv.

Melchior Cano quotes, on computation, twenty passages, sufficiently copious, bearing the names of the Popes of the first centuries. But, of these twenty passages, how many are authentic? Two only. The eighteen others are extracted from the false decretals.

The whole is but a tissue of forgeries, now admitted to be such, and of which the great theologian was the victim.

Now, be good enough to notice, Monseigneur, this is no mere assertion which I have to disprove. It is a fact admitted, a fact obtained from history, a fact no longer disputed by anyone. From the last century, Pius VI., in his letter of 1789 to four Metropolitans of Germany, admitted the forgery of the decretals of the Pseudo-Isidore in these words: "Let us put aside this collection, and let it be burnt, if you will." "Seponamus collectionem hujusmodi, igni etiam, si placet, concremandam."

Melchior Cano then regards as authentic all these documents, which are only fit to be burnt; and he puts into the mouths of the twenty Popes whom he quotes, the falsehoods of the Pseudo-Isidore.

It is necessary to be aware that there exists at the present day a classical collection, descriptive of the decretals of the Pseudo-Isidore, in which the true and false decretals are distinguishable at a glance by the form and type of the printing. Each of the false ones, thus laid bare, is classed in its place and

numbered. These guilty ones are condemned, locked up, and can no longer do harm.¹

Now, every reader can verify at once that which we assert. Let him open the chapter of Melchior Cano (*De Locis theologicis*, lib. iv., cours de Migne). Let him take the classical collection of Hinschius, and verify the references which I am about to give.

S. Anacletus is charged with two false decretals classed at pages 74 and 83; S. Evaristus contributes the false decretal classed at page 84; S. Alexander has that at page 35; S. Sixtus that at page 108. The same applies to the Popes S. Eleutherus, S. Pius I., S. Victor, S. Zephyrinus, S. Marcellus, S. Eusebius, S. Melchiades, S. Mark, S. Julius, S. Felix, and S. Damasus.²

This is not all. Besides these eighteen forged passages, attributed to the Popes of the first centuries, the author quotes, in the same chapter, two letters of S. Athanasius, one addressed to Pope S. Mark, the other to Pope S. Felix. These two letters are forged documents, proved apocryphal and absurd in the edition of the Benedictines of Saint-Maur in 1698.³ "We have hesitated," say

¹ *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianæ et Capitula Angilramni*, par Paul Hinschius. ex officinâ Bernhardi Tauchnitz, à Leipsiz, 1863.

² Voir pour Saint Eleuthère la page 125, et pour les autres les pages 116, 127, 131, 223, 230, 242, 452, 456, 484, 500, et suivantes.

³ S. Athanasius, vol. ii., p. 675. Amongst the apocryphal passages occurs this letter to Pope Felix. The editors say: "Hæsimus aliquando "dubii, an ederemus necne . . . hæ sane commentis et mendaciis "respersæ, exque variis locis consarcinatæ. Verum ne quid in nostra "editione lector vel ex spuris desideraret, visum est eas denuo pub-

the editors, “ in publishing these two documents . . .
 “ as being too full of fables and falsehoods picked up
 “ here and there. But, lest anything, even amongst
 “ the apocryphal passages, should be wanting in our
 “ edition, we have thought it right still to publish
 “ them. They are only fragments, gathered from all
 “ parts, extracted from synodical letters, decrees of
 “ Councils, and stitched together by a forger, who, the
 “ better to deceive the reader, changes the proper
 “ names, and distributes at his will the years and
 “ names of the consuls.”

This is not all yet. In this same chapter, what end in view have these forged letters of S. Athanasius, and the forged reply of the two Popes? To establish that the Council of Nicæa taught the opinion maintained by the author—that is to say, the equivalent to infallibility. But the Council of Nicæa is well known. Never had anyone heard of such a thing. Undoubtedly; but the reason is that up to the 16th century they did not know the Arabian Canons of Nicæa. The two forged letters of S. Athanasius quote these Arabian Canons. And forthwith, in the 16th century, twenty-four Canons of the Council of Nicæa, written in Arabic, are discovered. And these new Canons affirm the thesis of Melchior Cano and Bellarmine. Do you see the force of these combinations?

“licare. . . . Non sunt istæ nisi fragmenta, exque variis locis, ex
 “ historia tripartita, ex multis synodalibus epistolis et decretis Concili-
 “ orum, hinc inde excerptæ, et a falsario quidam consarcinatæ, qui ut
 “ fucum legentibus faceret, nomina persæpe propria immutavit, annos
 “ arbitrato suo et consules adscripsit.”

But consider for a moment. The whole Church, ever since the Council of Nicæa, knew by their number, and each one by name, the twenty Canons defined by this great Council. The Canons of the Council of Nicæa are counted, are as well known as the chapters of the Gospel. There were twenty, and not one more. But, in the 16th century, suddenly were discovered, in favour of the rights and prerogatives of the Holy See, about twenty-four, which had remained unknown to the Church and the world during more than a thousand years. Now, I ask if common sense is not sufficient here to do justice to such a fable, which, moreover, scientific criticism has destroyed, so that not a single word remains. See the dissertation of Héfélé upon this subject.¹

I still remember the day when this chapter of Melchior Cano first came under my notice, it was about fifteen years ago.

All these passages and the sacred authority of these twenty Popes, amongst whom I imagined I heard Anacletus, the second successor of S. Peter, and then his other immediate successors, filled me with the deepest astonishment. At that time I only knew the false decretals by name, and I never thought of them in any way. I should never have dared to suspect Melchior Cano of such an error. What! said I to myself, did the second successor of S. Peter, S. Anacletus, write already as the Popes of the mediæval period: "Let the more difficult

¹ Héfélé, *Histoire des Conciles*, t. i., § 41.

“ questions and *the greater causes* be referred to the
 “ Apostolical See; for thus have the Apostles them-
 “ selves appointed by order of the Saviour? ” “ Diffi-
 “ ciliores quæstiones et majores causæ ad Sedem
 “ Apostolicam referantur; quoniam Apostoli hoc
 “ statuerunt jussione Salvatoris.” This same Pope
 wrote to “ *the Patriarchs and Primates* respecting
 “ the supremacy of the Holy See over all the Churches
 “ and over all the flock—a privilege conferred upon
 “ the Roman and Apostolic Church, not by the
 “ Apostles, but even by Jesus Christ himself.”¹
 “ Hæc sacrosancta Romana et Apostolica Ecclesia,
 “ non ab Apostolis, sed ab ipso Domino Salvatore
 “ nostro, primatum obtinuit, et eminentiam potestatis
 “ super universas Ecclesias.” All my ideas of
 history and ecclesiastical literature were upset! I
 quitted this question without solving it, to enter
 upon another; and it is only lately that I have taken
 up this chapter again. But, when I did so, I had
 before me the collection of the forged decretals,
 and everything became clear. Blessed be science,
 daughter of God! which is able to pour the light
 into these depths, and thus defend the true Faith
 against these sacrilegious forgers.

Such, Monseigneur, is one of the antecedents of
 the theological question which now occupies men’s
 minds. This is one of the foundations of that doctrine
 which you say is acknowledged by the greatest names
 in theology in all ages.

¹ Melchior Cano, *De Locis Theologicis*, lib. vi., cap. iv.

II. Well, Monseigneur, Bellarmine takes the same line as Melchior Cano, S. Liguori the same as Bellarmine. Bellarmine is even less trustworthy than Melchior Cano, because he does not possess his transparent sincerity. It is he who admits, in the Liturgy, those changes introduced *a posteriori* by the inspiration of God. But S. Liguori is no more trustworthy than Bellarmine, because, in his admirable candour and his gentle holiness, he does not think of suspecting a fraud.

There is no need to take the same course again here, with respect to Bellarmine and S. Liguori, that I have already taken with respect to Melchior Cano. Everyone who is at all literary can do so for himself. All our brethren in the priesthood possess the Moral Theology of S. Liguori. All can consult, somewhere or other, the work of Bellarmine, *De Romano Pontifice*.

For instance, I have before me the chapter in question, in S. Liguori.¹ He collects all the passages of Melchior Cano and of Bellarmine, and he maintains that the Pope is absolutely infallible. He begins by quoting a passage of S. Irenæus: "All must of necessity depend upon the Roman Church, as their source and head." "Omnes a Romana Ecclesia necesse est ut pendeant, tanquam a fonte et capite." Now this passage is a pure invention. It is not to be found in S. Irenæus. S. Liguori has

¹ S. Liguori, *Theologia Moralis*, t. i., *De Infallibilitate Papæ*. Ed. Mellier, p. 109 et suiv.

copied it from somewhere or other, without verifying it. After which our dear saint admits as true the two forged letters of S. Athanasius, quoted by Melchior Cano. He then enumerates the whole list of the forged decretals adduced by that same author. "Idemque senserunt plures alii Pontifices, Evaristus, Alexander I., Sixtus I., Pius I., Victor, Zephyri- nus, Marcellus, Eusebius, et alii quos refert Cano."

Thus, Monseigneur, I have kept my promise. For I enable you to see clearly the false documents, the work of the Pseudo-Isidore, upon which you have been working. Melchior Cano was deceived by the forger, Bellarmine by Melchior Cano, S. Liguori by all the others. Now, Monseigneur, you are the son and the disciple of S. Liguori, whom, in your tract upon Infallibility, you put forth as one who should more and more be introduced into theological teaching, and whom you call "the most potent echo of tradition in modern times."¹

Well! it seems to me that when a doctrine possesses such antecedents, it ought to be modest, and not make haste to get itself elevated to an article of Faith. And I do not intend to maintain that a true doctrine may not be dishonoured for a time by knaves and impostors. But I say that, when a truth is in question, its cause must, above all, be absolutely severed from this adulterous mixture.

May I be allowed to say that the gentle and amiable S. Liguori has given proof of an unjust

¹ *De l'Infallibilité*, p. 84.

contempt for science, by maintaining the forged decretals as a theological basis, until the end of the 18th century—that is to say, until the period when Pius VI. declared that these documents were only fit to be burnt.

It is perfectly clear that, upon this question, Melchior Cano, Bellarmine, and S. Liguori have ceased to be authorities at all, or rather they are witnesses telling against the doctrine, since with them the doctrine depends, in great measure, upon frauds now unmasked.

For be good enough, Monseigneur, to take into consideration that, to purify these authors and make them just authorities on this point, it would not be sufficient simply to take out the false passages which are to be found in their works, but it would still be necessary to follow up, in all their pages, the innumerable consequences of these false materials, and even, which is a more delicate matter still, to rectify the false meaning spread around on all sides by these frauds. Is this possible? It is a poison which has penetrated everything. Science can and must, on this point, challenge these authors.

And allow me to tell you now, Monseigneur, this is the basis upon which you rely in opposing the Bishop of Orleans, as though he were an author of error. Then, with all the courtesy and grace which ever accompany both your words and actions, you propose to him to retract! You propose to him to retract—he who declares the simple, palpable truth

—you who depend upon frauds, shewn to be such for two centuries past!

In presence of these facts, Monseigneur, we must first, if we are children of light—if we are disciples of Him who said, “I am come to bear witness of the truth”—we must, if only we are men of honour, we must hurl far away from us with disgust, with horror, with indignation, this work of the forgers. We must reject it with *éclat*, with solemnity; so that, throughout the whole world, no one shall be able to suspect in any of us the least mental reservation of maintaining any result of these miserable impostures.

III. See, then, Monseigneur, how, as regards modern times, the greatest names in theology, in your opinion, Melchior Cano, Bellarmine, S. Liguori, all together support, in fact, your thesis of personal infallibility. But how? By depending chiefly upon the bases which we have just seen.

But let us ascend to mediæval time. Let us seek the master—I mean S. Thomas Aquinas, that grand genius, that great saint.

Well! upon this particular theological question, upon the question of pontifical sovereignty and infallibility, this is what happened to S. Thomas Aquinas. He fell a victim to the second great fundamental falsehood of which I spoke at the commencement. This is a fact now admitted, like the fact of the forged decretals.

A forger of the 13th century invented passages,

which he assigns to several Councils and several Fathers, especially to S. John Chrysostom and to S. Cyril of Alexandria. By these passages, this wretch deceived first Pope Urban IV., then S. Thomas Aquinas, in the same way as lately another has tried to deceive the Academy of Sciences by forged letters of Galileo, Pascal, and Newton. You must read the dissertation of Father de Rubeis, the Dominican, prefixed to the tract, "Contra Errores Græcorum." I have just been studying it. The author defends the good faith of S. Thomas Aquinas, which has no need of any defence; but he admits the fact of the falsifications. He cannot deny that in the work of the master are found quoted the following false passages from the Greek Fathers, viz. : three fraudulent fragments of S. Cyril of Alexandria, and twelve other false documents, assigned either to the Councils of Constantinople and Chalcedon or to S. John Chrysostom and other Greek Fathers.

Father de Rubeis admits that S. Thomas was deceived by these passages; that he regarded them as authentic; that he made use of them, both in this tract and three others of his works; but that, at the close of his life, he seems to have discovered, or at least suspected, the fraud. "In his *Summa*," says he, "S. Thomas no longer quotes these lying passages, indicating sufficiently his thoughts by 'this silence.'" "Silentio isto deprehensam aut 'saltem olfactam falsitatem indicante.'" We are, then, you and I, Monseigneur, more and more com-

pelled to believe, since our own eyes see it, in the existence of deceit, falsehood, imposture, and fraud in these great questions.

Once more, then, it is this collection of false documents and false traditions of the Schoolmen which deceived you, as S. Thomas Aquinas was deceived.

But it is necessary to insist upon the gravity of the fraud which deceived S. Thomas, as also upon the gravity of the consequences.

A forger brings to Urban IV. a sort of *Thesaurus Græcorum Patrum*, in which passages of pure invention are mingled with authentic extracts from the Greek Fathers. These extracts are some of them selected, others forged for the purpose of combatting the errors of the Greeks with regard to the Holy Spirit and the rights of the Papacy. Urban IV. hands the manuscript to S. Thomas for examination. S. Thomas has not even a suspicion that anyone could invent and have the temerity to present to the Pope lying extracts from Fathers and Councils. Nevertheless, these passages surprise him. His report to Urban IV. begins thus : “ I have read with
 “ great attention, Most Holy Father, the book which
 “ you entrusted to me. In it I found many things
 “ useful for the defence of our faith. But I think it
 “ right to say that the benefit that may be drawn
 “ from it might be diminished by this fact, that in
 “ these passages and authorities are found things
 “ doubtful, which might give occasion to errors,

“disputes, and unjust accusations.” This is the *début* of the tract, *Contra Errores Græcorum*.

S. Thomas was, then, at first astonished. But imagine any theologian whatever, and S. Thomas himself, struggling, in his candour, with passages which astonish him, but which he believes to come from S. Chrysostom, S. Cyril of Alexandria, or even from those great early Councils which S. Gregory the Great accepts as the Gospel itself. S. Thomas does not dare to reject that which seems strange to him. He strives to submit to S. John Chrysostom and the Councils. He bends beneath the intellectual violence exerted upon him. He alters his mind on certain points. He ends by writing that which otherwise he would never have written. These errors get a footing in the School, and come down even to us.

In my Third Letter, Monseigneur, while studying your theological argument and the support which you receive from the passages of S. Thomas Aquinas, we shall see how one of the consequences of this fraud has come down to you, and now also deceives you in your Reply to the Bishop of Orleans.

IV. From what has been already said it is, then, clear that still, upon this one and the same question of absolute sovereignty and personal infallibility, it is of absolute necessity to challenge S. Thomas and his school. We must challenge him, at least, in others of his works besides the *Summa*, or, at all

events, at the very least, in those of his works in which he quotes and transmits the lies of the forger. This, I say, is our simple duty, if we love the truth and have a horror of falsehood.

You can no longer, then, say, Monseigneur, that, for that which concerns the mediæval period, no less than modern times, your argument “possesses the “splendour of a positive truth—a truth admitted “by the greatest names in theology in all ages.” Both in modern times and in the mediæval period, the frauds now admitted, and the authors who depend upon them, form the principal authority in favour of this argument—that is to say, the very greatest presumption of forgery which it is possible to imagine. What are we to say now of the early centuries, when these two great fundamental falsehoods did not exist, since one of them is of the 9th and the other of the 13th century?

Well, Monseigneur, I must say that, among the great names of theology, you have not in your favour a single authority, either Greek or Latin, in the first five or six centuries, and not a single Greek authority at any time whatever.

Let us discuss first the Greek authorities. The very learned Father Perrone endeavours to bring forward for this thesis some Greek authorities.¹ He mentions, as usual, the famous passage of S. Irenæus, then a passage of an old author whom he does not

¹ P. Perrone, *De Locis Theologicis*, part i., sect. ii., cap. iv.

name, and the sense of which is not apparent, then the authority of Origen, next that of S. Cyril, whom he does not quote. Let us examine these authorities. First, that of S. Irenæus. Father Perrone only refers to him *en passant*, and does not quote him. Now turn to the passage referred to.

And first of all we have already seen how S. Liguori, quoting S. Irenæus in this same book and this same chapter, makes the holy doctor speak these words: "All must of necessity depend upon "the Roman Church, as their source and head." "Omnes a Romana Ecclesia necesse est ut pendeant, "tanquam a fonte et capite."¹ Now, S. Irenæus never wrote these words nor their complete equivalent.

Besides, to appreciate the value of this famous passage of S. Irenæus, it ought to be known that the Roman Breviary sums up the doctrine of this holy doctor on this subject in a manner altogether incorrect, as we shall see. And, first of all, the doctrine is as follows:—

"The Lord of all gave to His Apostles the power
 "of the Gospel, through whom also we have known
 "the truth—that is, the doctrine of the Son of God;
 "to whom also the Lord said, 'he that heareth you
 " 'heareth Me, and he that despiseth you despiseth
 " 'Me and Him that sent Me.' We have learned
 "the plan of our salvation from none others than

De Infallibilitate Papæ, lib. i.

“ from those, through whom the Gospel has come
 “ down to us, which they at first announced by word
 “ of mouth, but which afterwards they wrote down,
 “ by the order of God, to be the ground and pillar
 “ of our faith. . . They have preached to us the
 “ glad tidings of the good things of God, and pro-
 “ claimed the peace of heaven to men, *who, indeed,*
 “ *do all equally and individually possess the Gospel of*
 “ *God.* Qui quidem et omnes pariter, et singuli
 “ eorum, habentes Evangelium Dei.¹ . . We refer,
 “ then, the heretics to the tradition which comes to
 “ us from the Apostles, and which, by their suc-
 “ cessors, *is preserved in the Churches*—in Ecclesiis
 “ custoditur.² Now, this tradition of the Apostles
 “ is manifest throughout the whole world; it is
 “ visible in the whole Church or in every Church (*in*
 “ *omni Ecclesia adest respicere*) to whomsoever wishes
 “ to see it; and we are able to give the names of
 “ the Bishops instituted by the Apostles, and
 “ enumerate their successors. . . But, as it would
 “ be very tedious to enumerate the succession of the
 “ Bishops in all the Churches, let us confine ourselves
 “ to the very great, the very ancient, and universally
 “ known Church (*maximæ, et antiquissimæ, et omnibus*
 “ *cognitæ*), to the best known of all the Churches,
 “ that founded and organized at Rome by the two
 “ most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul, (and by
 “ questioning it) we may learn the tradition which

¹ Contra Hæreses, lib. iii., cap i., n. 1.

² Ibid, cap. iii., n. 2.

“ comes to it from the Apostles, and the faith which
 “ it proclaims to men. By which we put to con-
 “ fusion all those who, in any way whatever, from
 “ vainglory, or from blindness, or from perversity,
 “ affirm that which they ought not to affirm.”
 “ For,” says S. Irenæus, “ it is a matter of necessity
 “ that every Church should agree with this Church,
 “ on account of its eminent primacy (*son eminente*
 “ *primauté*¹)—that is, the faithful everywhere, inas-
 “ much as in it the apostolical tradition has been
 “ preserved continuously by those who exist every-
 “ where. Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam propter potio-
 “ rem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire
 “ Ecclesiam, hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles, in
 “ qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique conservata
 “ est ea quæ est ab apostolis traditio.² . . It is not,
 “ then, necessary to seek elsewhere the truth, since
 “ it is easily found *in the Church, the Apostles* having
 “ made *of the Church* a rich bank, in which they have
 “ amassed all the treasures of truth; so that every
 “ man, whosoever will, can draw from her the water of
 “ life. . . That if a dispute should arise relative to

¹ (On this difficult but important expression, “*potio-
 rem principalitatem*,” which Father Gratry renders *éminente primauté*, I add the valuable note
 of the present Bishop of Lincoln (Dr. Wordsworth), given in chap. xii.,
 p. 200, of his “St. Hippolytus and the Church of Rome.” He translates
 the expression *greater antiquity*, and says, “*Principalitas*, in the old
 “ Latin version of Irenæus (as Stieren has shewn), is used in the same
 “ sense as in Tertullian for priority of time (see S. Iren., v. 14, v. 21),
 “ and is opposed to *posterioritas*. . . The original words used by Irenæus
 “ were probably *ικαυωρέραν ἀρχαιότητα*. In this same chapter, the
 “ Latin translator has rendered *ικαυωρατη* by *potentissima*. The Church
 “ of Rome was the only Church in the west that was *known to have been*
 “ *founded by Apostles*. It had, therefore, a *potentior principalitas*, ‘a
 “ more august primitiveness.’”)—Note by the Translator.

² Contra Hæreses, cap. iii., n. 1 et 2.

“ a detail of tradition, should we not have recourse
 “ to *the most ancient Churches (nonne oporteret in*
 “ *antiquissimas recurrere Ecclesias, in quibus Apostoli*
 “ *conversati sunt)*, in which the Apostles themselves
 “ have lived, and learn from them immediately what
 “ is certain and clear upon the question ? ”¹

The reader has here before him the whole doctrine of S. Irenæus upon this subject. This doctrine is perfectly clear. It is almost the same as that of Tertullian, who says: “ Run over the apostolic
 “ Churches, in which are found the chairs of the
 “ Apostles, upon which are seated the Bishops who
 “ succeeded them, in which are still read their
 “ authentic letters, each echoing the voice and
 “ representing the face of its author. Is Achaia
 “ near to thee? Thou hast Corinth. Art thou
 “ near Macedonia? Thou hast Philippi; thou hast
 “ the Thessalonians. If thou canst travel into Asia,
 “ thou hast Ephesus. If thou art near to Italy, thou
 “ hast Rome, where we can find also traditional
 “ authority ” (*authority at hand, Lat.*) “ Percurre
 “ *Ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ cathedræ*
 “ *Apostolorum suis locis præsentur, apud quas*
 “ *ipsæ authenticæ literæ eorum recitantur, sonantes*
 “ *vocem et repræsentantes faciem unius cujusque.*
 “ Proxime est tibi Achaia? Habes Corinthum.
 “ Si non longe es a Macedonia, habes Philippos,
 “ habes Thessalonicenses. Si potes in Asiam tendere,

¹ Ibid, cap. iv., n. i.

“ habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiæ adjaces, Romam, unde nobis quoque auctoritas præsto est.”¹

It is the doctrine of S. Augustine. It is that of Pope Pelagius I., upon *the Apostolic Churches*. This Pope, praising S. Augustine on the subject of this same doctrine, expresses himself as follows upon the cause of schisms: “ This is the reason why they are schismatical. That which divides them is not so much their difference of judgment, as a certain vague fear of an unknown evil, and a certain distrust with regard to the Apostolic See. The real essence of schism, as S. Augustine denounces it, is as follows: He who rashly pledges himself against the authority of those Churches (*illarum Ecclesiarum*), which have been thought worthy to receive Professions of faith and apostolical epistles (*apostolicas fides ac epistolas*), that man cannot call himself exempt from the terrible crime of schism. Consequently they would be the Church; and, as there are not two Churches, we should be the schismatics, or else, *if it be certain, on the other hand, that the true Church is in the Apostolic Sees*, it is our adversaries who avoid unity, who avoid communion, which is only to be found in unity.”

“ Idpsum enim magis est, propter quod schismatici sunt; qui non eos diversa sentiendi judicium, sed quædam apud se delata, sibi tamen incognita metuentes, *et contra Apostolicam Sedem temere*

¹ Tertullian, *De Præscriptione adversus Hæreticos*, c. xxxvi.

“*credentes pessima divisit opinio. Quod schisma*
 “*specialiter esse beatus denunciavit Augustinus dicens*
 “*de talibus: Qui adversum auctoritatem illarum*
 “*Ecclesiarum, quæ apostolicas fides et epistolas*
 “*accipere meruerunt, temere credit, immanissimum*
 “*schismatis crimen a se propulsare non poterit. Ad*
 “*summam, aut illos Ecclesiam esse creditis, et cum*
 “*duæ Ecclesiæ esse non possint, nos, quod absit,*
 “*schismaticos judicabitis; aut si veram in Apostol-*
 “*icis Sedibus esse constat Ecclesiam, et illos ab*
 “*unitate divisos cognoscite, et communionis quæs-*
 “*tionem esse sublatam, quam veram nisi in unitate*
 “*constat esse non posse.*”¹

Now, the Roman Breviary sums up as follows the doctrine of Irenæus, who holds the same opinion as Pope Pelagius I. and S. Augustine: “In the third book of heresies (written about 180), the man of God, instructed by witnesses who had been disciples of the Apostles, bears a grand and magnificent testimony concerning the Roman Church and the succession of its Bishops, *the faithful, perpetual, and most certain guardian of divine tradition.* It is to this Church, says he, by reason of its pre-eminent authority (*propter potiozem principalem*), that the whole Church must conform—that is, the faithful everywhere.” “In tertio libro, vir Dei ab iis edoctus quos auditores constat fuisse Apostolorum, grave in primis atque præclarum de

¹ Labbe, Concil., t. v., p. 806.

“ Romana Ecclesia, deque illius Episcoporum suc-
 “ cessione, divinæ traditionis fidei, perpetua, cer-
 “ tissima custode dixit. Atque ad hanc, dixit,
 “ Ecclesiam, propter potio-rem principalitatem necesse
 “ est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est eos qui
 “ sunt undique fideles.”¹

We see that the Roman Breviary presents us with a different doctrine from that of Irenæus. Irenæus, like Tertullian, S. Augustine, Pope Pelagius I., like all the doctors and Christians of that time, altogether ignores that exclusive and absolute privilege of the Roman Church. The authority is in the Apostles, and in the Churches founded by them. But the chief authority is in the apostolic Churches, properly so called—those in which the Apostles lived. But, amongst the apostolic Churches, there is the very ancient and very great Roman Church, founded by S. Peter and S. Paul. Listen to it. But why must we listen to it? Because the succession of its Bishops, as in the other apostolic Churches, is a faithful, perpetual, and certain guardian of divine tradition—“ traditionis fidei, perpetua, certissima custode.” These last words are not those of S. Irenæus, but sum up his doctrine upon the authority of the *apostolic Churches*. Now, the Breviary applies them to the Roman Church alone. But is there not, in favour of the Roman Church, another reason, according to S. Irenæus? Here

¹ Breviaire Romain. Office de Saint Irénée, leçon.

the Breviary adds the passage itself of S. Irenæus, but does not quote it quite fully. “Ad hanc enim
 “ Ecclesiam, propter potiore[m] principalitatem, necesse
 “ est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est eos qui
 “ sunt undique fideles.” The phrase is not finished. The Breviary does not quote the end of the phrase, and puts a full stop instead of these important words :
 “ In qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique conservata
 “ est ea quæ est ab Apostolis traditio.” “ This
 “ Church, in which is always preserved, by the
 “ faithful throughout the world, the true tradition
 “ of the Apostles.” It is said that the meaning of this ending is obscure ; but is the meaning of the beginning less so ? Does not this ending seem to indicate that the idea of S. Irenæus is analogous to that of S. Gregory of Nazianzum, who says somewhere or other, “ Constantinople, the eye of the
 “ world, the bond between the west and the east,
 “ hither from all sides everything great hastens and
 “ meets there ; from it, too, everything sets out and
 “ spreads itself, as it were from the common Emporium
 “ of the Faith ” (*ὡς ἀπὸ ἐμπορίου κοινῆς πίστεως*).¹

Admit now that if S. Gregory of Nazanzum, the theologian, had spoken these words of Rome, instead of applying them to Constantinople, they would have become one of the grand theological bases of infallibility.

In every case, the Roman Breviary, summing up

¹ Ed. Migne, S. Grég. de Naziance, t. ii., p. 470.—*Œuvres Complètes*, Paris, 1778, i., 755.

the doctrine of S. Irenæus, takes that which is favourable to the Roman argument, and omits all the rest. The thesis of S. Irenæus, placed at the commencement of the dissertation, is this: We must bring back the heretics “to the tradition of “the Apostles, which, by their successors, is preserved in the Churches.” “Ad eam traditionem “quæ est ab Apostolis, quæ per successiones presbyterorum in Ecclesiis custoditur.” This thesis is repeated at the end. “When there is any doubt, “we must have recourse to the ancient Churches” —“in antiquissimas Ecclesias recurrere.”

From this formal thesis of an appeal to the *Apostolic Churches*, the Roman Breviary deduces the exclusive appeal to the Church of Rome, without any mention at all of the other apostolic Churches, or the reason which S. Irenæus gives why tradition is better preserved at Rome.

This, Monseigneur, out of all the Greek authorities, is the strongest in favour of your thesis. Does it indeed favour it? Is it not even contrary to it? Or, to say the least, is it not entirely different? What I see clearly is the doctrine of the primacy of the Holy See, in these words: “Propter potioem principalitatem.” This we all admit.

V. Let us now continue our study of the other Greek authorities adduced by Father Perrone.

There is the authority of S. Cyril of Alexandria,

to which Father Perrone refers us in Ballerini¹ I only find as follows. S. Cyril advises John of Antioch to acquiesce in the judgment delivered in a Roman Council by Pope Celestinus. He says to him: "We must submit, if we do not wish to be separated from the communion of the entire west." "Ut necessarium est iis qui a totius occidentes communionem excidere noluerint." And at the end he says again: "As for ourselves, we submit to this judgment. Let us fear to separate ourselves from such numerous and great authorities." "Veremur nempe ne a tantorum communionem excidamus."

I ask, then, what is there to be seen in these words which Bossuet has not said a hundred times with far more force? What traces do you see there of absolute sovereignty and infallibility, personal or not personal?

So, then, up to this point there is no Greek authority. But Father Perrone quotes Origen also in favour of the argument.

Here Father Perrone, as may happen to the wisest men, is absolutely mistaken. His mistake is in taking the pro for the con. The passage which he quotes from Origen, as being in support of his argument, is a proof in four pages, *ex professo*, of the opposite argument.

"These words," says Origen, "*Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God*,—if we say them

¹ Ballerini, *De Vi et Ratione Primatus, Rom. Pontif.*, c. xiii. § 2, et c. xv. § 11.

“ to the Saviour, not by the inspiration of flesh and
 “ blood, but by the light kindled in our hearts by
 “ our heavenly Father, we become then ourselves that
 “ which Peter himself is, and blessed like him. . .
 “ We become Peter, and it is to us that the Word
 “ says ‘Thou art Peter’ and the remainder of those
 “ words. Every disciple of Christ is that Rock on
 “ which all who follow Christ may feed, and upon
 “ each of these it is that every ecclesiastical dogma
 “ is founded.

“ *But if you wish to imagine that God built His*
 “ *Church only upon this Peter alone, what will you*
 “ *say of John, Son of Thunder, and of each of the*
 “ *other Apostles?* Will you, then, dare to say that
 “ the gates of hell shall not prevail against Peter,
 “ but that they shall prevail both against the other
 “ Apostles and against other saints? Is it not, then,
 “ in all and each that these words are fulfilled, ‘The
 “ gates of hell shall not prevail against it,’ and this
 “ other, ‘Upon this rock will I build My Church?’
 “ *Was it to Peter alone that God gave the keys of the*
 “ *kingdom of heaven,* and do not all the other blessed
 “ ones possess them? If, then, this gift is common
 “ to them all, will not the rest also of that which
 “ was said to Peter be common to them all also?
 “ Yes, all that was said to Peter was said to all, to
 “ all those who confess Jesus Christ as Peter did.
 “ To them he said, ‘Thou art Peter,’ and all the
 “ rest, even to the end—‘and the gates of hell shall
 “ not prevail against it.’ Who is the ‘it’? Is it

“ the Rock upon which the Church is built, or is it
 “ the Church herself? There are two meanings.
 “ Might it not be that the Rock and the Church
 “ are the same thing? This is my opinion;
 “ and I affirm that the gates of hell shall pre-
 “ vail neither against the Church nor against
 “ the Rock upon which Jesus Christ builds the
 “ Church.”

I do not discuss in any way this doctrine of Origen. Origen was often mistaken. I affirm only that it is the contrary thesis to that of personal Infallibility, and every privilege for S. Peter exclusively. It is, in fact, the denial of the doctrine in favour of that for which they appeal to it.

VI. You see, Monseigneur, how, in proportion as we ascend to the early centuries, the evidence of the great names in theology, the great Doctors, and the early Fathers becomes less clear and less favourable to your argument.

Not being able to find any traces of a doctrine in the Greek Fathers of the first five centuries, finding at the same time the directly contrary doctrine, or, to say the least, very different, is not that alone sufficient to destroy this doctrine?

But how does it happen that they find authorities, even Latin ones, not in favour of Infallibility, personal or impersonal, of which they then had not the slightest suspicion, but simply in favour of the Holy See, and bringing to light some prerogative other

than the primacy, which the rest of the Apostolic Sees did not possess ?

They depend upon two or three passages, always the same ones, notably upon S. Irenæus and S. Augustine. They make S. Irenæus, like S. Liguori say : “ Omnes a Romana Ecclesia necesse “ est ut pendeant, tanquam a fonte et capite.” “ All “ must of necessity depend upon the Roman Church, “ as their source and head ”—words which Irenæus never uttered. Or else, Monseigneur, they assign to S. Augustine that saying, as you do in your letter to the Bishop of Orleans : “ Roma locuta est, causa finita est.” It is certain that this formula of S. Augustine possesses something decisive and absolute about it, like an axiom. It says everything. Rome has spoken, the cause is decided. Rome has spoken ; all is said, the rest is of no consequence.

But the objection to this is, that S. Augustine never said that at all. Here is the passage of S. Augustine, in which, as for myself, I find the primacy of the Holy See—and this is the object of my wishes, for it is what we all believe—but I do not find this saying, neither the assertion, even implied, that to him alone the judgment of Rome is everything, as the formula expresses it : “ Roma locuta est, causa finita est.” This is the passage : “ Already, in this cause, have “ two Councils sent their Acts to the Apostolic See, “ and the rescripts have been returned. The cause “ is decided.” “ Jam enim, de hac causa, duo Con- “ cilia missa sunt ad Sedem Apostolicam, inde

“ etiam rescripta venerunt. Causa finita est.” To which if the other well known passages be added, we have the whole doctrine of S. Augustine, which is that of Bossuet, who everywhere says the same thing.¹ Here are the passages. The holy Doctor says to us : “ It is safe for us, not rashly to hazard “ any opinion which, accepted at first in a private “ Council, has not afterwards been completed by a “ plenary Council, but to affirm, with full confidence “ and aloud, that which, under the government of “ our Lord Jesus Christ, our Lord and our God, has “ been confirmed by the consent of the Universal “ Church.” “ Sed nobis tutum est, in ea non pro- “ gredi aliqua temeritate sententia quæ nullo in “ Catholico regionali Concilio cæpta, nullo plenario “ terminata sunt, id autem fiducia securæ vocis “ asserere quod in gubernatione Domini Dei nostri “ Salvatoris, Jesu Christi, Universalis Ecclesiæ con- “ sensione roboratum est.”²

S. Augustine says to us again : “ We should not “ dare to affirm these things, were we not supported “ by the unanimous authority of the Universal Church. “ To which, without any doubt, he himself (S. Cyprian) “ would have yielded, if, at that time, the truth with “ regard to this question had been brought to light, “ established, declared by an Universal Council.” “ Nec nos ipsi tale aliquid auderemus asserere nisi “ Universæ Ecclesiæ concordissima auctoritate firmati.

¹ S. Augustin, *Sermo cxxii.*, éd. Gaume, t. v. Pars prior, p. 930.

² De Bapt. contra Donatistas, lib. vii., n. 102. Éd. Gaume, t. iv., p. 330.

“ Cui et ipse (Cyprianus), sine dubio cederet, si jam
 “ illo tempore questionis hujus veritas eliquata et
 “ declarata per Plenarium Concilium solidaretur.”¹

Do such passages as these leave any room for the doctrine of personal Infallibility? In good faith, read again before God the decisive words of S. Augustine, and ask yourself what the great Doctor thought of personal Infallibility. Try this test, praying to God the while.

This is how our great and glorious Fathers of the 5th century speak to us of the Councils and the supreme authority of the Church. It is thus that they ought to be spoken of.

Suffer me, Monseigneur, to complain to you of the number of false passages put into circulation by the ignorance and audacity of this school of error with which I contend.

Fénelon was well aware of this. “ Nothing wise
 “ pleases them,” said he. “ All moderation they
 “ hold in contempt. Nothing is too preposterous
 “ and extravagant to delight them. Nothing is too
 “ difficult for their audacity to maintain. I dread
 “ them for the Church more than the sects of the
 “ heretics.”² But Fénelon did not yet attribute to them the habit of false passages, interpolations, and mutilations.

¹ Ibid, t. ix., liv. ii., n. 5, p. 184.

² “ Sobrii sapere nolunt. Temperata quæque aspernantur. Nihil est
 “ abnorme ac devium quod illis non arrideat. Nihil est arduum quod
 “ tueri non audeant. Hos sane plusquam hæreticorum sectas Ecclesiæ
 “ metuo.”—(*De Summi Pontif. Auctoritate Dissertatio.*)

What I am now about to quote, I attribute to no one. I suspect no one's good faith. The authors whose names I give may have been deceived by others or by the blindness of passion. Now, inattention is not a fraud. Besides, I declare, and I believe I have already declared, that, in these Letters, I only accuse of falsehood and fraud two men, of whose names I am ignorant, viz., the Pseudo-Isidore and the author of the Greek *Thesaurus*.

Here, then, is a German theologian, Doctor Weninger, whose book has just been translated into French. Referring to the Commentary of S. Augustine upon the words of the Saviour, "Quæ sunt oves meæ vocem meam audiunt," he quotes the passage of the holy Doctor as follows: "*Vox ejus (Christi) de Romana Ecclesia non est obscura.*"¹ I turn to the passage, and I find, "*Vox ejus de Ecclesia non est obscura.*" Thus the author interpolates the passage; he adds himself the word *Romana*, which is not there, although, too, the context expressly states that it refers to the Universal Church: "*Jam vero istæ divinæ voces de Universa Ecclesia ita manifestæ sunt.*"

The same author brings forward the authority of S. Ambrose in these terms: "*The Roman Church* "may be tempted," says S. Ambrose in the second book of his treatise, *De Fide ad Gratianum*, "but "changed never." "Aliquando tentata, mutata "nunquam." I turn again to the passage, and I

¹ S. Augustin, t. ix., p. 359, n. 32.

find, not the *Roman Church*, but *Italia*. Thus the author has substituted the words *Roman Church* for the word *Italia*.

Another instance. S. Augustine relates in his letters that the Pelagians “*Conciliorum Episcopaliū* “*vigilantia . . . etiam a duobus venerabilibus antistibus* “*Apostolicæ Sedis . . .*” then, “*toto orbe Christiano.*” Afterwards the holy Doctor quotes the very words of Pope Zozimus, and proves that “in *these words* of “the Apostolic See is contained the expression of the “ancient and fundamental Catholic Faith so firmly “and clearly, that *it is unlawful* for any Christian to “doubt it.” “In his *verbis* Apostolicæ Sedis tam “antiqua atque fundata certa et clara est Catholica “Fides, ut nefas sit de illa dubitare Christiano.”¹ In order to extract from this passage a proof of Infallibility, Father Weninger says nothing about the Episcopal Councils, *Conciliorum Episcopaliū*, nor the Faith of the whole world, *toto orbe Christiano*; he only quotes the last words of S. Augustine, omitting the word *his*, and, by means of this simple suppression, he elevates to the position of a general maxim that which S. Augustine merely applies to the particular fact in question, to the actual words, *his verbis*, of Pope Zozimus.

There is, then, here, on the part of some one, an intentional omission, a material falsification, together with false reasoning, conformable to the thesis of the author, but not to the passage from S. Augustine.

¹ Ibid, t. ii., p. 1062.

This same author, to finish with him at once, wrote that the Holy Father defined the dogma of the Immaculate Conception without regard to the opinion of the Bishops; whilst the Bull, on the contrary, takes great care to state all the requests made beforehand by the Episcopate to the Holy See. “Ab antiquis temporibus Sacrorum Antistites . . . ab hac Apostolica Sede enixe efflagitarunt ut Immaculata Sanctissimæ Dei genitricis Conceptio veluti Catholicæ Fidei dogma definiretur. Quæ postulationes hac nostra quoque ætate Iteratæ Fuerunt . . . ac nobis ipsis Oblatæ sunt.”¹ This is the work of which the newspaper, *Le Monde*, affirmed that it is the most imposing testimony ever produced in modern times in favour of personal Infallibility; that the author gives to the testimony which he invokes a kind of universality and, by his mode of procedure, a force and clearness beyond comparison; that, when a passage is in question, he quotes the whole of it.

But what will you say, Monseigneur, of the following proceeding, which I now submit to your delicate loyalty? I in no way accuse the author of the book. I have reasons for believing that he is not guilty. I know not what the author of the fact is; but the fact itself is as follows:

In 1868 a Summary of the Councils, in two volumes, was published.² In it I find, at page 315 of the first

¹ Voir l'Office de l'Imm. Concept.; 15 Déc., 2^e Nocturne.

² *La Somme des Conciles*, par M. Guyot.

volume, the judgment pronounced by the VI. Council at its thirteenth session : “ Having read the dogmatic letters written by Sergius, formerly Patriarch of this Imperial city, both to Cyrus, Bishop of Phasis, and to Honorius, formerly Pope of old Rome, more-over the reply of the same Honorius to the aforesaid Sergius, and finding them to be altogether alien from the teaching of the Apostles, the definitions of holy Councils, and the sentiments of eminent Fathers, and altogether agreeing with the errors of the heretics, we reject and abhor them as soul-destroying ; and, thus abhorring their impious dogmas, we have judged that the names of their authors ought to be cast out of the holy Church of God—*i.e.*, of Sergius, formerly Bishop of this imperial city ; of Cyrus of Alexandria ; of Pyrrhus, Peter, and Paul, who also sat on the throne of Constantinople ; of Theodore of Pharan—all of whom the most holy and blessed Agatho, Pope of old Rome, mentions in his rescript to our most pious and illustrious Emperor ; all of whom he rejects as holding opinions contrary to the orthodox Faith, and whom we have smitten with anathema. We have also read the Synodical letters of Sophronius, of venerable memory, formerly Bishop of Jerusalem, the holy city of God, and, finding them to agree with the true Faith, with the teaching of the Apostles and eminent Fathers, we receive them as orthodox and of advantage to the Holy Church Catholic and Apostolic ; and we have,

“affirmed that his name ought to be inserted in the diptychs of the Churches.”

The reader has before him the text of the judgment of the VI. Council, and he sees that Honorius is not condemned in it. But whence does this result? From the fact that they have, purely and simply, taken out of the text of this judgment, as if it had been cut out with a pair of scissors, the following passage, which occurs in all the collections of Councils: “At the same time we have cast out of the Catholic Church and anathematised Honorius, Pope of old Rome, because we have found, in his letters to Sergius, *that he adopts his teaching in all things*, and confirms his impious judgments.”

They have cut out this fundamental part of the judgment, which occurs between the words, “and whom we smite with anathema,” and the words, “We have also read the Synodical letters of Sophronius.” Between these two phrases is the passage of the condemnation of Honorius. They simply cut it out, by omitting to put several stops between the two phrases thus tacked together.

I beg all those persons, and they are very many in number, who are interested in these questions, to distrust the passages adduced by the school of error with which I am contending, which the Bishop of Orleans has so happily named *Romanism gone mad* (Romanisme insensé), which Fénelon has so well denounced, and of which he says, with profound truth,

he dreads it for the Church more than all the heretical sects.

Yes, truly, such a school would cause the weak to lose their faith. It makes one giddy to see such masses of error built upon the foundation of ancient impostures, and their consequences maintained as if the imposture had not been unmasked.

VII. I now sum up all this Letter.

I have kept the promise which I made on the appearance of my First Letter. I have shewn, Monseigneur, that, to establish your thesis, that of personal Infallibility, you have been working upon false documents. I say the same of all those who maintain the same thesis, without any exception. They have all, directly or indirectly, been working upon false documents, now admitted as such. The question is absolutely gangrened with fraud. Your assertion that this doctrine of personal Infallibility “possesses the splendour of a positive truth—a truth “admitted by the greatest names in theology in all “ages”—is, when confronted with texts and facts, so astounding, that it would be nearer the truth to maintain the opposite argument—namely, “that this “doctrine is evidently false, not having been admitted “by any of the great names of theology in any age, “save only by those whom the falsehoods and the now “admitted frauds have deceived.”

We have seen that wonderful chapter of Melchior Cano in favour of Infallibility, in which the illustrious

theologian introduces eighteen grand forged passages, borrowed either from the false decretals, or from the apocryphal letters of S. Athanasius, or from the Arabian Canons of the Council of Nicæa. Upon this thick stratum of forgeries he constructs his theological edifice.

But Melchior Cano is followed by Bellarmine, who works upon the same basis, although with some precaution and some discernment with regard to the passages which he brings forward. It seems as though he already has doubts.

But after Bellarmine and Melchior Cano there is S. Liguori, who, without a suspicion of anything, reproduces the same passages, already proved false a hundred and fifty years since, and, upon this void, reconstructs the same edifice.

These, Monseigneur, are precisely the false documents upon which you have yourself worked, since you are the son and disciple of S. Liguori. That these documents should have deceived you up till now does not astonish me, since I myself, fifteen years ago, supposed them authentic; only I avoided following out the consequences of my belief. This shews the necessity of introducing amongst us more important studies of ecclesiastical history, and of expelling from this history, henceforth scientifically worked out in elementary treatises, the falsehoods which disgrace it.

I could have shewn you also, Monseigneur, with regard to this question, the secular efforts of the

liturgists of the Roman Court to stifle the truth by the alteration of the Breviary : the condemnation of Honorius everywhere carefully blotted out ; the false decretals introduced on all sides ; the fable of Sinuessa supplying the axiom, *Prima Sedes a nemine judicatur* ; the history of S. Damasus curtailed, because he is a Pope tried and acquitted by a Council ; many Popes of the early centuries introduced at the close of the 16th century, always in company with the false decretals ; the same operation practised at the close of the 17th century in the office proper *pro clero Romano* ; and that, too, fifty years after the full proof of the fraudulent character of these documents. These are the grounds, historical and liturgical, put forward, in these later ages, in support of absolute power and personal Infallibility.

But let them pass. I have shewn you, Monseigneur, in the mediæval period, the genius and holiness of S. Thomas Aquinas deceived upon this question by the *Thesaurus* of the Greek Fathers and Councils, in which are found the passages invented in favour of the exaltation of the Holy See by a forger of the 13th century. This is the other basis of error upon which you have been working, as we shall see in my Third Letter.

Ascending to the time of the Fathers, to that period when these two great falsehoods did not exist, we no longer, in any way whatever, find traces, at least in the first five centuries and amongst the great names, of the doctrine which you say is admitted by the

greatest names in theology in all ages. Now, the first five centuries are evidently by far the most worthy of our entire respect. That which does not exist in the first five centuries does not exist at all, if I may so express myself.

We have seen, in the Roman Breviary, how, by cutting off from the celebrated passage of S. Irenæus the last part of the phrase, "In qua semper ab his, "qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quæ est ab "Apostolis traditio," a meaning is given to the text of S. Irenæus very different from that of the holy Doctor. We have seen S. Liguori attributing to him a decisive axiom, which in no way at all is found in the text. We have seen the very learned Father Perrone, in order to extract something from the early Greek Fathers in favour of the thesis, quoting from S. Cyril certain words, which do not in any way, in favour of the Holy See, come up to the warmth of the words of Bossuet or those of Mgr. Maret.

And we see the same Father Perrone bringing forward a Commentary of Origen, in which the great Doctor absolutely maintains the very contrary of the thesis, and refuses to perceive in the Gospel any kind of privilege for Peter; another thesis which we are far from admitting, but which is the thesis of Origen in the place indicated.

We have seen that the famous adage, *Roma locuta est, causa finita est*, is not found in S. Augustine. We have seen, in fine, passages interpolated from

S. Ambrose and from S. Augustine, in order to attain to the same end.

Do you know, Monseigneur, in the history of the human mind, any question, theological, philosophical, historical, or otherwise, which has been so disgraced by falsehood, bad faith, and the whole work of the forgers? I say it again, It is a question utterly gangrened by fraud.

Is it not time for men of honour, men of sincerity, men of faith to look this scandal in the face, and drive from the temple, no longer only the sellers, but the robbers and the coiners of base coin, religious or moral?

These are more guilty than the forger who, in France at this time, has been handed over to justice for having forged and trafficked in false scientific documents.

VIII. Now, at the sight of this audacity and this power of falsehood introducing itself into theology—at the sight of these errors and palpable forgeries, promulgated, by the authority of authors themselves entirely sincere, up to the time of the Council of Trent, and even up to the end of the 18th century, and even up to this present time, I can understand that all those who do not take in the whole of the questions should be seized with giddiness, and cry out, “What, then, can we believe now? What become the bases of the faith?”

I hasten to give a brief and peremptory reply to

this objection, which, I think, will satisfy all minds, the most simple as well as the most learned.

It is, that all these falsehoods and all these frauds tend only to one point, a single one, and in no way to any other. The treasure of the Catholic Faith is here in no way in question. "We bear this treasure," says S. Paul, "in earthen vessels." Well! all the falsehoods of which I have already spoken, and all those of which I shall speak, tend to the vessel and not to the treasure. Our treasure is Jesus Christ, His Gospel, His real Presence, the Eucharist, Penance, and the remission of sins; the dogma of the Communion of Saints, the visible existence of the Holy Church, our Mother; the fact of eternal life, the life divine and supernatural, conferred upon souls when this life is over. This treasure is immaculate, entire, certain, incontestable, beyond the reach of frauds and doubts. Fear nothing, Christian souls! Feed upon the divine life, the sources of which are known to you. In every village of every Christian country, the priest of Jesus Christ holds the keys of the Church, into which you may enter to recline, as the Apostle S. John did, upon the bosom of the Saviour Jesus, and you can ask of Him His soul, His heart, His blood, His mind, His divinity; this is our treasure. It will not be taken from us. But what is the earthen vessel? The earthen vessel is the policy of the Church. The Popes, you say perfectly well, Monseigneur, are not infallible in the government of the Church (p. 13). Now, it is in the

political aspect only that the quarrel is treated rigorously, and that this contention arises. Our Lord Jesus, the beloved Master, teaches us this in prophetic words, as all His words are: "A contention arose amongst the Apostles," says the Gospel, "which of them should be the greatest." "Contentio facta est inter eos quis eorum videretur esse major." Now, at the present day the courtiers of one of the twelve Apostles, of him who, moreover, is, in the eyes of all, the greatest, these courtiers seem to say to the Christian people, "He is everything, the others are nothing." This is the dispute foreseen by Jesus Christ. Let us not be troubled about it, the Church of Jesus Christ will not perish through this dispute. She has passed through other crises; the contention between the anti-Popes was far more terrifying than the present dispute. Let us be full of confidence in God, in our Lord Jesus Christ, in the Holy Spirit, Who governs the Church, and carries it on towards its end—the conquest of the whole world. Yes, I believe—yes, I know that, in spite of the crimes, the follies, the falsehoods, and the errors of men, I know that the Holy Spirit will most certainly display, in the Catholic Church and in the whole world, all justice, all truth, all liberty. And He will reunite in justice, and in truth, and in liberty all the men of goodwill who dwell throughout the whole earth. They will come back from the East, they will come back from the North, and with us they will spread to the new West, to our brothers now separated.

The epoch of science will come, and it is already beginning by the severe criticism of the falsehoods which have deceived us, which have divided us, but which rage only upon the surface of the earthen vessel, without touching in any way the treasure. Brothers beloved, have confidence ! “ In the world “ you will have tribulation,” said the Lord, “ but be “ of good comfort, I have overcome the world.” “ In “ mundo pressuram habebitis ; sed confidite, Ego “ vici mundum.”

As to myself, I desire here to thank God for bringing me on to the close of life with an increasing conviction—a conviction firm in me at twenty years of age, when I took my vows for life. God be praised ! for nearly forty years I thank Him daily for my blessed calling. I thank Him above all for having borne with me so long ; and I thank Him the more earnestly, as my years flow by, that He deigns to increase, I do not say the firmness, but the peace, the light, the evidence, the serenity of my Faith. And the present dispute—shall I dare to say so?—instead of making me sad, fills me with a new joy. How can this be ? It is because I understand more clearly now than ever, why our admirable Mother, the Holy Church of God, the Mother of humanity, whose spirit is nothing else than the unity of all the just who have ever lived—I understand, I say, why our beloved Mother, even at this day, scarcely rules a twentieth part of the human race. The reason of the slow progress is this ; it is the secret and internal

foe which stops our march ; it is the school of error which I denounce, and which is none other than the obstacle foreseen by Christ, those *gates of hell* which will attempt, but in vain, to prevail against the Church.

Now, the clear view of the enemy, of his works and his actions, fills me with hope. Behold him, the hidden enemy !—behold him unmasked ! I see that he will be expelled, and that the Holy Church, delivered from a part of the obstacle, will go on advancing in her divine splendour to conquer the world. This made clear, let us resume, with as much vigour as calmness, the pursuit of our enemy.

This I hope to do, Monseigneur, in a Third Letter.

[*Authorised Translation.*]

MGR. THE BISHOP OF ORLEANS,

AND

MGR. THE ARCHBISHOP OF MALINES.

THIRD LETTER

TO

MONSEIGNEUR DECHAMPS,

BY

A. GRATRY,

Prêtre de l'Oratoire, Membre de l'Académie Française.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH BY

T. J. BAILEY, B.A.,

Priest of the Church of England.

LONDON:

J. T. HAYES, LYALL PLACE.

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO., PATERNOSTER ROW.

BRIGHTON: G. WAKELING.

[*All rights reserved.*]

It is understood that this letter, like all my other works, simply represents the opinion of the author, and does not bind the Oratoire in any way.

A. GRATRY,

Priest of the Oratoire,
Member of the Academy.

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE.

As several of the translations, of which the Latin text is given, are not strictly literal, I think it right to add that the translations are made from the French of Father Gratry, and not exclusively from the Latin.

T. J. B.

THIRD LETTER TO MONSEIGNEUR THE
ARCHBISHOP OF MALINES.

Monseigneur,

I have no longer only to reply to the letter addressed by you to the Bishop of Orleans, but you have deigned to address to myself a *First Letter*, or *Introduction* to a continuation of works entitled : “ *Letters to the Reverend Father Gratry.*”

The public will see in this, as I do myself, a great honour which you confer upon me. But what the public cannot see, is the private letter which, on the same day, your heart, both as Bishop and friend, addressed to me.

I had never seen, in this respect, in a polemical contest, the heart rising above the strife, and saying : “ Whatever may happen, the friendship between us is for life and death.”

But, further, Monseigneur, you are good enough to propose to me a struggle to the death,—one which includes the entire destruction of the error which prepossesses one or the other of us : a struggle in

which one of the adversaries must surrender and acknowledge himself to have been deceived.

This, Monseigneur, has been the dream of my life ; a dream well-nigh impossible, and which, perhaps, has never been realised. But "that which is impossible with men," says the Gospel, "is possible with God." Now, God is that charity which fills your heart, Monseigneur and my brother,—that charity which, after your example, I hope to preserve in mine.

I accept, then, with all my heart, that which you propose to me, and I promise to admit forthwith any error that you may point out to me. May God be between us, and may all this discussion, which began like a battle, end with a harvest.

I am going to reply first, Monseigneur, in a few words, to your *Introduction* ; then I shall pursue the consideration of your Letter to the Bishop of Orleans.

I.

Must I begin by a complaint, Monseigneur,—a complaint against yourself?

But I mean to limit myself to a complaint. That which I had written here in my own defence, I suppress. I have not truly the time to attend to the defence of myself. It is the Church that I must defend against the school of error which now troubles it.

Yes, it is the Church that I defend, in openly deploring this which follows : I am accused of failing in my duty to the Church our Mother, because I

denounce the pernicious falshood of the decretals in the Instructions of the Roman Breviary. Is the Breviary, then, the Church? and are the legends the Breviary?

But, what then! if one fails in one's duty to the Church, in wishing to erase errors in the Instructions of the Roman Breviary,—what is to be said of those who wish to erase dogmatic decrees in Œcumenical Councils?

And is not this what we find?

“*The Question of Honorius*,”—such is the title of the letter you address to me, Monseigneur.

After having maintained that the Councils never dreamt of condemning Honorius as heretical, the contrary being demonstrated with superabundance of passages and facts, you now, Monseigneur, introduce the reply of the theologians who maintain that Honorius was condemned “by an error of fact;” and that the documents written in his defence, prove that the Council really fell into this error.¹

Here, then, are three General Councils, which, in their dogmatic decrees, really fell into error, in having condemned Honorius. How can any one say thus? Do they want to deny the Sovereign Authority of General Councils? No, undoubtedly; but they maintain that these Councils, pronouncing, in their dogmatic decree, the condemnation of an obstinate heresy, upon a passage which they declare dogmatic, did not intend to pronounce upon a question of faith.

¹ Pp. 22 and 23.

They maintain that not only did they not pronounce upon a question of faith, but not even upon a dogmatic fact. Upon what, then, did they pronounce? *upon a particular fact*. Now Councils may be mistaken upon a particular fact.

Thus the solemn judgment given in their dogmatic decrees by three Œcumenical Councils upon the dogmatic letters of a Pope, this judgment is not a dogmatic judgment! No, it is not a question here of a dogmatic fact! No, it is only an error teaching a particular fact.¹

I ask if anyone can understand this argument, and see anything else in it but absolutely empty words?

Yes, I ask what must be said of those who thus treat the decrees of Councils? who, seeing Honorius condemned by three Œcumenical Councils, without reckoning twenty Popes, simply reply that those Councils were mistaken? who, hearing the Church cry out, in her dogmatic decrees, "Anathema to the heretic Honorius!" smother with all their power this anathema, and, in their enthusiasm of disobedience and contradiction with regard to the Councils, cry out, in their turn, to drown the voice of the Church, "Honour to the *great Honorius!* honour to the *divine Honorius!*"

I find these qualifications, Monseigneur, in your tract upon Infallibility, and in your letter upon the

¹ But how is it that they do not see that the decision of *this particular fact* supposes and decides, implicitly, a *general principle* of immense extent, viz: that a dogmatic letter of a Pope, addressed to the most influential Patriarch of half the Church, may be heretical and condemned as such.

question of Honorius. It is perfectly clear, Monseigneur, that I do not ascribe to yourself these sentiments of disobedience. But I draw the final consequences of your thesis, to show that it is false.

II.

From all this, I only intend to infer against you, Monseigneur, and against so many other generous spirits following this path, but one single thing; that, as I said at the commencement of these letters, you have worked upon false documents, and this I have shewn you. I have shewn you the false documents, and I shall continue to fight against the school of error, which persists in circulating these false documents, and living by their consequences and in accordance with their spirit.

And, as for that which concerns Honorius, since you return to it, Monseigneur, I too must also return to it here in a few words.

You reply, then, Monseigneur, to the passages and facts which I have gathered together upon this question :

(1) By a passage of S. Liguori upon the question.

(2) By a promise of a fuller reply with decisive passages.

This promise, Monseigneur, you will not keep, unless you have discovered some treasure of unpublished passages.

Myself, and several others, for the last six months, have been working upon all the known passages.

We have taken them in their Latin and Greek originals. I have been able to get great help from a very learned unpublished dissertation of Father Garnier. I have made use of the very excellent work of M. de Rosière upon the *Liber Diurnus*; quite a recent work. Finally, we have had, a few days since, upon this point, in French, the most complete work which exists upon this subject,—viz., the volume which Mgr. Héfélé, in his magnificent History of the Councils, compiled over again from the originals, dedicates to the question of Honorius. I do not think that any thing can be discovered which is not in this dissertation.

Now, the conclusions which Mgr. Héfélé comes to, are ours also. It is a question absolutely decided. The more you defend this subject, the more will you be convicted of error, and the sooner will the literary public be enlightened upon this point.

As to the passage from S. Liguori, I reply, that S. Liguori could not have known the decisive works which I have just named; that, in addition, he seems not to have made acquaintance with the originals; and that, lastly, as his reply resolves itself into maintaining that the passage from the letters of Honorius is perfectly orthodox, that the Councils were mistaken, a reply of that kind cannot be taken seriously, as I have just shewn. It is a reply which a Catholic cannot admit; and I confine myself to saying, that, in the mouth of a Bishop, it is the most astonishing proof of preoccupations.

But they have also replied to me: “Undoubtedly

Honorius was condemned as heretical. We know that, you have taken too much trouble to prove it; but we reply, that these letters of Honorius were not dogmatic letters, and that the Council only condemned the private doctor."

This reply implies that no attention has been paid to the passages, since the Councils four times, at least, give the name of '*dogmatic letters*,' or '*writings*,' to the letters of Honorius. And these letters, being the replies of Honorius who was consulted as Pope by three Eastern Patriarchs, cannot be the replies of the private doctor.

But they insist upon it, and they say again: "Be it so; it is not the private doctor whom the Council has condemned as heretical, it is the Pope in the exercise of his functions, but not the Pope speaking *ex cathedra*." To which I reply: "What were then the conditions of the act *ex cathedra*? Who can say what they are now? Do we know two theologians who perfectly agree upon this point? We will speak about acts *ex cathedra* when we know what this word '*ex cathedra*' means.

I know solely and certainly that the letters of Honorius are *dogmatic letters*. They are addressed to the Patriarch of Constantinople, as the great letter of S. Leo was addressed also to the Patriarch of Constantinople. These letters of Leo and Honorius begin by the same formula; they have almost the same extent; they decide what must or must not be taught. The letters of Honorius, like those of S. Leo, are dogmatic



letters, destined to settle dogmatic teaching throughout the whole Eastern Church. But is it possible to settle dogmatic teaching for the Eastern Church, without settling it for the whole Church? What would a dogmatic decree be, which should not be for the whole Church? What does this distinction mean? Is it not really too light, and almost without consideration? That which is dogmatic for a Church, for a single soul, is dogmatic for the whole Church. To make an act *ex cathedra*, or the contrary, it will then suffice to write at the beginning, or to omit doing so, these words: "*For the whole Church, and with anathema.*"

I believe, Monseigneur, that both you and Mgr. Manning are perfectly aware of this, as well the most skilful defenders of Honorius. You know well that he did not write these letters as a private doctor; you know well that it is as Pope that he replied to letters addressed to the Pope.

Again, Monseigneur, what is the system which you and Mgr. Manning adopt with regard to the defence of Honorius? You maintain, absolutely, that he was not condemned as heretical, and that this is clear. You maintain this, although the contrary is evident. You maintain that, "not only did he not teach Monothelism, but that he formally taught the contrary." Mgr. Manning, in his turn, not having, any more than you or I, any doubt of the authenticity of the letters, maintains that these letters exist in order to prove the perfect orthodoxy of his

teaching. You maintain, in fine, that he was not condemned for heresy, but for negligence. I admit that S. Leo, in one of his letters, says that he was condemned for negligence. I have quoted the passage : "*negligendo confovit*:" but does that prevent his also having been condemned for heresy? No, since all the condemnations exist. They exist, for here are the passages, the authenticity of which is beyond doubt, and is not disputed by you : "We have expelled from 'the Catholic Church and anathematized Honorius, 'because, in his letters to Sergius, we have recognized 'that, in everything, he has followed the doctrine of 'Sergius, and confirmed his impious doctrines."

Now, a Pope is not expelled from the Catholic Church for a sin of negligence : "Cum his vero simul 'projici a sancta Dei Catholica Ecclesia, simulque 'anathematizari prævidimus, et Honorium, qui fuerat 'Papa antiquæ Romæ, eo quod invenimus per scripta, 'quæ ab eo facta sunt ad Sergium, quia in omnibus 'ejus mentem secutus est et impia dogmata confirma- 'vit."¹

Is not this sufficiently decisive? No, you will say, for the Monothelite heresy is not here in question.

Well, here is the passage in which it is in question. This passage is from the VII. Council in its dogmatic decree : "We proclaim in our Lord *two wills and two operations*, and with the VI. Council we reject Sergius, Honorius, . . . and all those who follow 'their teaching :'" "Deinde quoque et duas voluntates

¹ Hardouin, *Concil.*, v. iii. p. 1334.

‘et operationes in Christo prædicamus; quemadmodum
 ‘Constantinopoli sexta synodus exclamavit, abjiciens
 ‘Sergium, Honorium atque istis similia
 ‘sentientes.”¹ They are all condemned because they
 do not admit in Jesus Christ the two operations and
 the two wills.

Here, then, we find Honorius condemned for
 heresy, and on account of Monothelism. I am very well
 aware that he has contradicted himself, and I believe,
 with Mgr. Héfélé, that Honorius was not heretical at
 heart, nor even, perhaps, in spirit; but his letters are
 heretical, since three General Councils, in their
 dogmatic decrees, absolutely condemn them as such.
 Taken by themselves, such as we have them, we find
 really heresy. Honorius, when consulted respecting
 the unity or duality of will in Jesus Christ, did not
 cease to affirm and repeat this: “We must neither say
 one will nor two wills. Both one and the other are
 absurd: *satis ineptum*.”

Honorius, consulted upon this point as Pope, did
 then reply as if, when consulted upon the Trinity and
 upon the number of Persons, he had said: “We must
 neither teach One Person, nor Three Persons; both
 one and the other are absurd.” Is not this denying the
 dogma, and declaring that it is absurd? Is not this
 heresy itself?

Monseigneur, either nothing can be proved by the
 facts and the passages quoted, or I have fully proved
 this, when you say and repeat in your last letter:

¹ Hardouin, v. iv., p. 454.

“Far from teaching Monothelism, Honorius has ‘formally taught the contrary; this is evident. The ‘VI. Council never dreamt of condemning Honorius ‘as heretical; this is evident,”—Yes, I reply, I have proved that in speaking thus, you trample under foot all the facts, all the texts, all the dogmatic decrees of three Œcumenical Councils.

III.

Now, Monseigneur, let us resume your reply to the Bishop of Orleans. It remains for me to discuss your fundamental argument in favour of personal infallibility.

This is your argument: “Where the sovereignty is, ‘there is infallibility. Now, the Pope has the plenitude of power over the whole Church. . . . ‘The Bishops participate in his solicitude (*in partem sollicitudinis*), but *they have no share in the supreme power*; they do not enter *in participationem principatus potestatis*.”

To prove this, you quote those words of S. Thomas Aquinas, uttered respecting the power which the Pope possesses of dispensing indulgences: “The Pope has ‘the plenitude of pontifical power, as a king in his ‘kingdom; but the Bishops participate in his solicitude, as judges placed in each city:” *Papa habet plenitudinem pontificalis potestatis, quasi rex in regno: sed Episcopi assumuntur in partem sollicitudinis quasi iudices singulis civitatibus præpositi.*”¹

¹ Dist. 20, art. iv. q. 3.

I do not see what this passage of S. Thomas proves on the question. I perfectly see in it that the Pope has the plenitude of pontifical power ; but, saving the comparison between the judges and the king, I do not see any thing which tells us that "the Bishops have no share in the supreme power."

To enlighten me upon this subject, I open the *Summa* of S. Thomas, and in the index at the end of the book (*Index tertius*), I find reproduced, word for word, the passage which you have quoted. I expect to find it in the questions to which the *Index* refers me. It is not in the *Summa*.¹ It is somewhere else in S. Thomas, but in the *Summa Theol.*, at the place to which I am referred, this is what I have before me.

S. Thomas says : "The Pope has in the Church 'the plenitude of power The Bishops 'have in the Church the supreme power :'" "Papa 'habet in Ecclesia plenitudinem potestatis 'Episcopi obtinent in Ecclesia summam potestatem."²

Here then, at once, Monseigneur, S. Thomas Aquinas, consulted at the passage to which your quotation refers us, teaches the contrary doctrine to your fundamental thesis.

You say that the Bishops have no share in the supreme power ; S. Thomas Aquinas says that the Bishops have, in the Church, the supreme power. He does not say simply the contrary of what you affirm. He does not say only that the Bishops have

¹ Idem.

² 3a, q. 72, art. xi., corp. et ad 1m.

some share in the supreme power. He says, without any restriction : “ The Bishops possess, in the Church, ‘ the supreme power : ’ ” “ *Episcopi obtinent in Ecclesia ‘ summam potestatem. ’* ”

IV.

In reality, Monseigneur, how could S. Thomas have possibly favoured this proposition ? It would be a denial that “ the Holy Spirit has appointed Bishops to govern the Church of God, ”—those words of S. Paul which you quote, at the beginning of your letter. It would be a contradiction of all that Holy Scripture teaches upon this subject, of all that Jesus Christ has said or given to the Apostles, “ of whom the Bishops are the Successors, ” says S. Thomas Aquinas himself even ; “ *Apostoli quorum vicem gerunt Episcopi.* ”¹ S. Thomas evidently only sums up Holy Scripture and the passage of S. Paul, when he says simply that “ *the Bishops have in the Church the supreme power.* ”

I confess, Monseigneur, I ask myself with astonishment, how such a proposition could have introduced itself here ? Whence could so novel a proposition come ? It comes from the logical necessity, introduced here by the thesis of *separate infallibility* : a thesis, in reality, so strange and so novel that, when Mgr. Maret published his book, in which he repeats, on every page, that it is a question now of a new dogma,—namely, “ of personal, absolute, separate infallibility, ”—the learned Bishop was loudly accused and insulted,

¹ *Ibid.*

as guilty of having created a monster, to gain the honour of destroying it. They cried out that it was in no way a question of personal, absolute, separate infallibility.

Now, this is why, at present, Monseigneur, you grant that Mgr. Maret has stated the question well : "It is no longer now," you say, "a question only of infallibility *ex cathedra*. Mgr. Maret has understood this as de Maistre has done, and he has said with him . . . the question is, to know where, in the Church, the supreme power is to be found."

Upon this statement, you affirm that the Pope has, in the Church, the plenitude of power, which is true ; and you maintain, which is false, that the Bishops have, in the Church, no share in the supreme power. Then, by virtue of the major, "Where the sovereignty is, there is the infallibility," you deduce that the Pope alone possesses infallibility, and that the Episcopate has no share at all in this infallibility.

This is the teaching of Mgr. Manning. The learned Archbishop admits this teaching, by saying, that he wished formally to state precisely the contrary thesis to that of Mgr. Maret. The thesis of Mgr. Maret is, that personal, absolute, separate infallibility, is a false doctrine. The thesis of Mgr. Manning is, that personal, absolute, separate infallibility, is the true doctrine.

Mgr. Manning states it in these terms : "The Pope 'is infallible, alone, apart and separate from the 'Episcopal body, whether congregated or dispersed."

Therefore, to arrive at the doctrine of separate infallibility, we must, by all logical necessity, maintain this surprising proposition, that the Bishops have, in the Church, no part in the supreme power.

But S. Thomas Aquinas says the contrary.

V.

All the doctrine of S. Thomas, upon this subject, rests upon this double proposition: "The Pope has, 'in the Church, the plenitude of power, and the Bishops have, in the Church, the supreme power:" "Papa habet in Ecclesia plenitudinem potestatis. Episcopi obtinent in Ecclesia summam potestatem."

This is the true, the complete doctrine, admirably expressed by S. Thomas in these two united propositions. Yes, the Pope has, in the Church, the plenitude of power, and the Bishops have, in the Church, the supreme power; that is to say, the sovereignty belongs, at the same time, to both.

This is the doctrine of S. Antoninus. It is the theological adage: "*Una igitur potestas, una utriusque potestas.*" From whence it must follow, according to you, Monseigneur, that infallibility belongs, at the same time, to both, when they are united, as is said in the Acts of the Apostles: "*Nobis collectis in unum.*"

This is the doctrine of the Scriptures. It is the doctrine, too, of the Saviour. It is the doctrine of tradition, and of true theology throughout all

ages. It is the doctrine of the Council of Trent. It is that which you declare here also yourself, Monseigneur, by these words, which are the true solution of the difficulty: "The Church is a living body, and for the infallibility of the head to be separate, the head itself must needs be separated from the body, and the Church in consequence be destroyed."

I mark these fine words, Monseigneur, to show that, after all, you do not admit the doctrine of separate infallibility.

Again, when Mgr. Manning speaks of a separate infallibility, and says that the Pope alone, apart and separate from the episcopal body, whether congregated or dispersed, is infallible, it seems to me clear, that he puts forth a very great error, and that he lays down as a principle the destruction even of the Church.

Thus, from the first, Monseigneur, your reply to the Bishop of Orleans commences by an error, bearing upon the very foundation of all your argument. S. Thomas, upon the power of the Episcopate in the Church, teaches the contrary to that which constitutes your thesis, namely: "That the Bishops have no share in the supreme power."

S. Thomas does not merely say that they have a *share in the supreme power*, he says more, for he says: "*The Bishops, in the Church, have the supreme power:*" "*Episcopi obtinent summam potestatem in Ecclesia.*"

Here, then, Monseigneur, we find S. Thomas opposed to that thesis of Joseph de Maistre, which you adopt as your own. But believing, on the contrary,

that you have this great authority on your side, you add, by way of simple affirmation, that this doctrine, summed up by you, and which you believe to be that of S. Thomas, is that of all tradition. You go so far as to see, in this doctrine, "the splendour of a positive truth,—a truth confessed by the greatest names in theology throughout all ages."

But what ! is not this assertion, as I have already shown you in my second letter, precisely the contrary to the doctrine of the Fathers, as the passage from S. Thomas, interpreted by the two passages from the *Summa*, teaches precisely the contrary to the doctrine which is in question ?

The basis of the new doctrine of separate infallibility is this double proposition : "The Pope has, in the Church, the plenitude of power ; and the Bishops have, in the Church, no share in the supreme power."

If the first of these two propositions is found everywhere, and especially in S. Thomas, the second is found nowhere ; and the contrary to this second proposition is found everywhere, and especially in S. Thomas.

Now, for separate infallibility, the Bishops must needs have no share in the supreme power. This last proposition being *insupportable* and *unheard of*, we must say the same of *separate infallibility*.

VI.

But we must follow out here the consequences of the passage from S. Thomas upon which, Monseigneur,

you found your theological argument : “ Papa habet
 ‘ plenitudinem pontificalis potestatis quasi rex in regno.
 ‘ Episcopi autem assumuntur in partem sollicitudinis
 ‘ quasi iudices singulis civitatibus præpositi.”

This passage from S. Thomas, quoted by you, Monseigneur, at the beginning of your letter, and which compares the Pope in the midst of the Bishops to a king in the midst of his subjects, seems to me little worthy of the genius of S. Thomas, and in itself false and unbecoming. This passage, I have already said, is not found in the *Summa*, in which neither are the false passages of the Greek *Thesaurus* to be found, but in the IV. Book of the *Distinctions*, chap. xx.

Now, has it not clearly issued from the pen of S. Thomas, under the influence of a forged passage of S. Chrysostom, quoted a little further on, in the same IV. Book of the *Distinctions*, question xxiv. ?

This last passage is as follows. The author of the Greek *Thesaurus*, that forger of whom I spoke in my second letter, and who deceived Pope Urban IV., and consequently S. Thomas,—this forger, speaking in the name of S. John Chrysostom, puts into the mouth of Jesus Christ, these words addressed to S. Peter : “ Be thou the Head and Prince of thy
 ‘ brethren ; and in my name and place, let them sur-
 ‘ round thee,—Thee, seated upon thy throne,—and let
 ‘ them shew thee and make thee known to all the
 ‘ peoples of the world.”

Assuredly, whosoever has the smallest idea of the genius of S. Chrysostom, and of his epoch, will

imagine the terrible indignation of this great man, if any half-converted pagan had dared to utter these words in his presence. S. John Chrysostom knew well that when the Gospel and the Apocalypse speak of thrones for the Apostles, it is of twelve thrones, and not one single throne, that the Holy Spirit speaks. This passage is a falsehood. . . . It is not in S. Chrysostom,—“*In Chrysostomo non occurrit*,”—says, in the margin, the editor of 1660, Father Nicolai.

Meanwhile, S. Thomas deduces from this falsehood and from this fraud a false doctrine, namely: “That ‘the power of binding and loosing was given at first ‘to Peter alone, to make it clear that this power ‘descends from Peter upon the other Apostles.’”

This is an error of fact, contrary to the text of the Gospel. The Gospel shows this power promised to Peter at first, then given to all at the same time. The texts are well known: “*Tibi dabo*,”—that is the promise. “*Accipite Spiritum Sanctum: Quorum remisistis*,” and the rest,—that is the actual gift made to all at the same time. Almost all the Fathers see in the “*Tibi dabo*” the promise only.

Let us picture to ourselves, then, this King seated upon his throne,—this King, from whom flow all light and all strength upon those who surround him, Bishops and others, who themselves are engaged in shewing him, in making him known through all the world, instead of and in the place of our Lord Jesus Christ. This would be, then, the form of the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ! The spirit of falsehood

suggested already these pagan and Asiatic images to the forgers of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

After which, we find madmen in the nineteenth century, introducing into conversations, nay, even teaching and writing these unimaginable doctrines : that the Pope is the Eucharist ; the Pope is the Holy Spirit ; that the Pope has the right to say, " I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life ;" that the world must at length be taught what the Pope is, and that this century is destined to accomplish for the mystery of the Papacy, that which the age of Arius did for the divinity of Jesus Christ ; that the Bishops ought by degrees to be reduced to become commissaries of the Pope ; that, by degrees, as in the French Monarchy, these great vassals ought to be diminished, whilst the power of the Pope should ever increase ; that the Councils are a useless disturbance ; that one of these assemblies, in the words of Joseph de Maistre, would be for our age a great misfortune.

Do we not see growing before our eyes the thought of the suppression of the Councils? Do we not hear it said : " This Council of the Vatican will be the last of the Councils! The era of Councils is at an end." In this one, has there not been a determination beforehand to smother all the freedom of the Bishops? Could it be true that it has been said : " We are about to take away from the Bishops, by an excellent regulation, the power of doing wrong (*la liberté du mal*)?"

Is it not to myself that a Priest, a man very pious, very zealous, very well informed, said and repeated

these words: "Yes, there is upon the earth a man who can say: 'I am the Holy Spirit?'" It is to myself that a monk, well-known, and deservedly so, said: "I adopt every thing which you have just enumerated and blamed." It is to myself that a most honourable Catholic writer, after a discussion upon this point, wrote a long letter to maintain, as pious and true, this proposition: "The Pope is the Eucharist."

They write that "we all know with certainty only 'one single thing, namely, that no man knows anything except one alone, except the man with whom 'God is for ever,—the man who hears the thoughts of 'God. . . . Everything consists in following 'firmly his inspired directions.'"¹

But listen to this: "The Sovereign Pontiff is the 'third visible presence of Jesus Christ amongst us. ' . . . He is the visible shadow which emanates 'from the invisible head of the Church in the Holy 'Sacrament . . . The Pope is for us, in our 'whole conduct, that which the Holy Sacrament is for 'our adorations. The mystery of his office, as Vicar, 'resembles the mystery of the Holy Sacrament: the 'two mysteries are intertwined, so to say, one with the 'other . . . One might as well try to be a 'good Christian without devotion to the Blessed 'Virgin, as without devotion to the Pope. The de- 'votion to the Pope is an essential part of Christian 'piety; an indispensable element of all Christian 'holiness. . . . The way in which the Pope

¹ L. Veuillot. *L'Illusion libérale*, p. 149.

‘represents God, is as if heaven were always open
 ‘above his head, and that, like Stephen, he saw Jesus
 ‘on the right hand of the Father. . . . We
 ‘must not allow ourselves any cowardly doubts upon
 ‘that which concerns his sovereignty, either spiritual
 ‘or temporal, for his temporal royalty is itself a part
 ‘of our religion. . . . We must not allow our-
 ‘selves the disrespectful disloyalty of distinguishing in
 ‘him and his ministry,—between that which we may
 ‘consider human, and that which we may acknowledge
 ‘divine.”

But who, then, is it who brings us this new religion? It is no less than a doctor in theology, priest of the Oratory at London, the pious and worthy Father Faber, in a sermon entitled: “*On Devotion to the Pope.*” Everybody may verify this. Yes! this is what the blind bring us as true Christianity! I think, Mgr., the Bishop of Orleans writes very mildly when he calls this foolish and culpable tendency “*Romanism gone mad.*” It is the very forgetfulness of Christianity. It is the contempt of the Gospel and of our Lord Jesus Christ.

VII.

Who does not see that on all sides they are labouring to obscure the Episcopate? Do you not see the new definition of the Church which a great number of Roman theologians have adopted: “The Church ‘is the company of the faithful who have as their
 ‘head Jesus Christ in heaven, and the Pope on earth?”

This is a definition of the Church in which the Episcopate goes for nothing. This, in truth, is what the sect wishes.

But what ! Monseigneur, did you not yourself, in your reply to the Bishop of Orleans, say something more extraordinary than has ever been said upon this point ? We have read it, we have discussed it ; but we have not paid attention to it. Yes, a day was to dawn in the history of the Church, when these words should be uttered by a Bishop : “ The Bishops in the Church have no share in the supreme power.” Thus, the Episcopate has no share in the sovereignty, no share in infallibility, no share in the supreme power ! The Pope is sovereign, and the Bishops are his subjects ! “ *Rex in regno, et iudices præpositi singulis civitatibus :*” a king and his subjects !

Here is the whole passage. After having quoted the comparison of the king in the midst of his subjects, “ *quasi rex in regno,*” you say : “ The power of the Bishops is of divine right, but by divine right also ‘ this power is subordinate ; and if the Bishops share ‘ the power which governs the Church, if by divine ‘ institution they enter *in partem sollicitudinis,* they ‘ have no share in the *supreme* power, they do not ‘ enter *in participationem principatus potestatis.*”¹

What does this mean ? I see in it four propositions :

(1) The power of the Bishops is of divine right.

(2) The Bishops share the power which governs the Church.

¹ P. 7 and 8.

But in what sense ?

(3) In the sense that they enter upon a share of the solicitude : *in partem sollicitudinis*.

(4) And that they have no share in the supreme power.

Of these four propositions, the last two destroy the first two, that is all ! Now, it is to the last two, Monseigneur, that you tie yourself. The Pope is sovereign, and the Bishops are subjects. For if the Bishops have the smallest share in the supreme power in the Church, all the argument falls to the ground. The sovereignty must be entirely in the Pope ; the Bishops, the Episcopate, must have no part in the sovereignty ; otherwise you can no longer construct anything upon this major : “ Where the sovereignty is, there is infallibility.”

Therefore, Monseigneur, your opinion, clearly stated, is in effect this : “ The Bishops in the Church have no share in the supreme power.”

This fully established, I ask where we are ? Are we in the Catholic Church ? Is there in the world, a Priest, a Catholic, a Christian, of no matter what sect, — is there in the whole world a man, who, having heard the Church spoken of, has ever heard this wonder proclaimed ?

Ought not an universal rising of consciences to reply to this astonishing attempt to change the constitution of the Church ? “ The empire,” said Tacitus, “ allowed the names of the old magistracies to remain : ” “ *Eadem magistratum vocabula.* ” The name of ‘ Bishop ’

remains assuredly, and the name of 'Councils' would remain also, but what does the Episcopate become, what do the Councils become, if the Bishops, whether congregated or dispersed, have no share in the supreme power?

What is it that I ask? What, then, do Catholics whose eyes are open, ask? They ask that Councils should not be abolished, nor the Episcopate destroyed.

Is this demand on the part of Christianity an excessive, rash, or culpable one?

What! one would be obliged to accept this page, which I am about to transcribe, of your letter to the Bishop of Orleans, and to see in it the type of the government of the Church!

Here is the page: "The thesis of Muzzarelli recurs to me again here, and I quote again this thesis, which cannot be refuted: 'He is and must be held personally 'infallible, who pronounces absolute dogmatic decisions, 'publishes and addresses them to all the faithful, and 'to all the Catholic Episcopate, without requiring the 'direct or indirect, expressed or tacit, consent of the 'Bishops, but by commanding them to publish and 'execute his decisions, and forbidding them to infringe 'them, or rashly to oppose them, under pain of ex- 'communication incurred *ipso facto*, restraining the 'Bishops who should attempt to discuss and judge his 'decisions, and protesting that he does not await their 'suffrages, but enjoins upon them obedience, as his 'predecessors in the Holy See have done, during a 'long course of centuries, not only without any objec-

‘tion from the Church, but with the consent of the
 ‘Universal Church, always submissive to the supreme
 ‘authority of the Holy See, whilst the small number of
 ‘Bishops who did the contrary, only remained in the
 ‘bosom of the Church by atoning for their murmurs
 ‘and opposition, by their excuses and their regrets.’¹

VIII.

Such, then, would be, Monseigneur, your ideal of the Papacy ?

Well ! I am about to show you this ideal in action in history. I am going to demand of you, of all Catholic Priests, and of all the faithful, if this is the ideal which they wish for.

Afterwards, Monseigneur, I hope to show you the true ideal, such as the divine institution, and the words of Jesus Christ established it for ever.

Here, then, as seen in history, is the power of the Holy See, such as Muzzarelli imagined it. That which I am about to quote is but one example.

There would be others to show also. But everything is found in a Bull of Paul IV., attempting, in the sixth century, to display, in fact, in all its extent and all its consequences, this supreme pontifical power, such as the school of bewilderment and error dreams it to be even now.

Here is the analysis of this Bull, of which I give, at the same time, the text entire. Pope Paul IV. desired that the Bull should be published, and read by all the

¹ Reply to the Bishop of Orleans, p. 23.

people. He desired that the whole world should remember it for ever. I do nothing, in publishing this text, but conform to that which the document itself orders. My analysis, moreover, is milder than the text.

It must be stated, that Paul IV. was a man of faith and ardent conviction: he wished to reform the Church, both in its head and its members. He wished to subdue heresy, to regenerate universal society, and to govern orderly the whole world.

But, filled as he was with his false ideal, convinced of his right and his omnipotence spiritual and temporal, this is how he set about reforming the Church and the whole of Christianity. The analysis of the Bull is as follows:

I. Considering that the Roman Pontiff possesses the plenitude of power over every kingdom and every nation, and that he alone, on the earth, judges all, and is judged by no one:

II. We renew all the sentences of excommunication which have ever been put forth against heretics, of whatsoever condition, be they Bishops, Patriarchs, or Popes; be they Kings or Emperors.

III. But, as spiritual punishments are not sufficient, We, in the plenitude of Apostolic power, sanction, establish, *decree, and define*, by the present constitution, which is to be perpetual, that all persons, Bishops or Cardinals and others, Princes, Kings, or Emperors, who shall be convicted of schism or heresy, in addition to the spiritual punishments aforesaid, incur, by the

fact itself, and without other legal process, the loss of all honour, all power, all authority, every principality, duchy, kingdom, empire, and will be for ever unable and incapable of resuming them. But, moreover, they must be considered as *having relapsed into heresy*,¹ as if they were condemned for the second time, as if, being already convicted of heresy, they had already abjured it, and then have fallen back again into it. From that moment, they must be delivered to the secular arm, so as to be punished according to law, unless that, truly repentant, they may, by the clemency and goodness of the Holy See, be sent to a monastery, there to do penance, on bread and water, for the rest of their lives. They must, moreover, be regarded as relapsed heretics by all men of every condition. They must be treated as such, avoided as such, and deprived of all the consolations of humanity.

IV. And as to the ecclesiastical benefices possessed by them, they will be conferred upon others at the appointed time.

V. As to those who shall dare to receive, defend, favour the condemned aforesaid, put confidence in them, entertain their doctrines, they incur themselves *ipso facto* the sentence of excommunication. They will be declared infamous, deprived of every right, of the right of giving testimony, of making a will, of inheriting. No one owes them anything, or is bound to

¹ For a relapse into heresy, the chastisement was punishment by fire without remission, even when sincere repentance was certain; but for these fictitious relapses Paul IV. proclaims here a mitigation.

be responsible to them in anything. If they are Judges, their sentences are null ; Lawyers, their patronage cannot be received ; Notaries, the acts or instruments drawn up by them are of no effect, and deprived of all force ; if they are Bishops, Patriarchs, Primates, Princes, or Kings, their properties, their domains, their kingdoms, become public property, and given over to the first occupant, provided the occupant be in the faith, unity, obedience of the Holy Roman Church.

VI. To which we add, that if ever, at any time, it is discovered that a Bishop, Archbishop, Primate, were it even the Roman Pontiff himself, had, before his promotion, fallen into heresy, or any deviation from the Catholic faith, such an one must know that, from henceforth, his ordination and his promotion are null, worthless, of no effect. He is neither Bishop, Cardinal, nor Pope, and all the acts, ministrations, functions, words, discourses, acts of administration, are absolutely null and void, and do not confer on any one any title or right.¹

VII. And they must all be looked upon as pagans, publicans, heretics.

VIII. Now, we decree all this, any apostolic constitution notwithstanding, any other decree given in a

¹ Whence it follows that, if it were discovered that a Bishop, or even a Pope, before his promotion, had in any way deviated from the Catholic faith, he would be neither Priest nor Bishop. The Priests whom he should have ordained, would not be Priests ; the Hosts which these latter, believing themselves Priests, should have consecrated, would not have been consecrated ; and the absolutions which these phantoms of Priests should have given, would not be absolutions.

contrary sense notwithstanding, of certain knowledge, and *in the plenitude of Apostolic power*, any article of law contained in the *Corpus Juris*, any promise, or even any oath, taken by no matter whom, even by Ourselves, notwithstanding. To all this we derogate expressly, but for this alone, and for this once only.

IX. And we desire that all those to whom it belongs take cognizance of these Apostolic Letters, and that they be affixed to the doors of the Basilica of S. Peter, to the Chancery Apostolic, and to the *Campus Floræ*, &c.

X. Let no one, then, dare to oppose in any way this decree, under pain of incurring the anger of Almighty God, and of the Apostles S. Peter and S. Paul.

IX.

These are the facts. Here, Monseigneur, is a most solemn Bull which is to be perpetual, and which marks out for ever the great lines of the government of human societies. I do not discuss whether this Bull is or is not *ex cathedra*, since no one knows what *ex cathedra* means. I say that it is an act of the greatest solemnity, an act maturely deliberated upon in Consistory, signed unanimously by all the Cardinals, addressed to the whole Church and even to the whole human race, imposing upon all the faithful, the duty of believing that the Pope is the master of all the kingdoms, that the crime of heresy brings down the punishment of death, and takes away at once, *ipso*

facto, without any other procedure, from every Prince his dominions, from every man all his rights and all his property; that every domain, every property, every principality, every kingdom of every man convicted of heresy, ceases to belong to him, *ipso facto*, and becomes the prey of the first occupant.

And all these things, Paul IV. declares that he *sanctions, establishes, decrees*, and defines them by the present constitution, which is to be perpetual.

Those who do not see in this the highest expression of the Sovereign authority of the Pontiff, at least in matters of law and morals, are difficult to convince.

Now, Monseigneur, what do you think of it?

What! this power which we see in force in this Bull, this is the power which appears not sufficiently strong, sufficiently unlimited, sufficiently absolute, personal, separate from every thing and above every thing, and which now must be crowned, exalted, with a crown of infallibility?

Are we men gifted with reason, or have we lost our reason? Have we preserved our moral sense, or have we given it up? Do we aim at voluntarily trampling under foot visible truth, manifest justice, and disposing God Himself, the Father of justice and truth? Do we aim at trampling under foot all the Gospel of Jesus Christ?

A power which has such antecedents, and which could, if need be, revive some portion of it, now or in time to come, this power requires neither to be augmented nor exalted; but it does require to be

brought back within its proper limits. By what means? By obedience to the canons, that is to say, to the laws of the Church.

This is the truth. And this, thanks be to God, will, most certainly, one day come to pass.

X.

Yes, truly, the gates of hell have tried to prevail against the Church; we see it. Yes, truly, ignorance, violence, and pride, every cupidity, every fury, every bewilderment, in one word, *the gates of Hell*, as the Gospel expresses it, have endeavoured to overthrow and dishonour the Papacy; but Hell will not prevail against it. That which Jesus Christ has founded, will endure for ever. Jesus Christ founded a centre of unity for His Church. The world shall know its beauty, its power, its glory, its humility, its necessity, its fruitfulness.

This, Monseigneur, I shall attempt to show in a fourth letter. I do not wish to stop with this criticism of our misfortunes, to which the audacious and violent pretensions of fanaticism and illusion have forced me.

We have to defend the Church. We have to defend the Evangelical institution of the Papacy. We have more and more to unmask, to expel the hidden enemy who is killing us, who entwines himself around the Church and the Papacy like a serpent around the feet of our Mother. Ah! yes, our hidden enemy is he of whom S. Bernard said: "They are

'hateful both to heaven and earth, because they
'have lain hands on both:.' "Invisi cælo terræque
'quia utrique manus injecere."¹

Our hidden enemy is that spirit which S. Bernard still apostrophises in those terms which Fénelon repeats: "Go, then, and if thou art the Empire, dare
'to seize the Apostleship; or if thou art an Apostle,
'dare to usurp the Empire. Both are forbidden you.
'If you desire to seize both, you will lose both:.'
'I ergo tu, et tibi usurpare aude aut dominans
'apostolatum, aut apostolicus dominatum. Plane ab
'alterutro prohiberis. Si utrumque simul habere
'voles, perdes utrumque."²

S. Bernard added, and Fénelon repeats: "How
'long dost thou hide from thyself, and refuse to
'understand the murmur of the whole world?"
'Quousque murmur universæ terræ aut dissimulas
'aut non advertis?"³

Our enemy, is the spirit which Melchior Cano saw chastised in Rome, when he addressed to the King of Spain the wonderful memorial which I dare not translate here, in which I find these words upon the *Curia Romana*: "Mal conoze a Roma, quien pretende sanarla." "*Curavimus Babylonem, et non est sanata.*" (*Enzinas, dos Informations, 1857. Appendice, p. 30.*)

The enemy is the spirit which the Council of Constance was endeavouring to drive out, when it de-

¹ S. Bernard.—*De Consideratione.* Lib. iv., cap. ii.

² Fénelon.—*De Auctoritate Summi Pont.*, cap. xi.—S. Bernard, *De Consid.*, lib. ii., cap. vi., cap. iii.

³ S. Bernard, *loc. cit.*, lib. iii. cap. ii.

manded the reform of the Church in the *Curia Romana*: “*Reformatio Ecclesiæ in Curia Romana.*” The reform of the *Curia Romana* is that which the supreme efforts of the Councils, and even of the Popes, have never obtained. Their decrees, on this point, are trampled under foot.

In a word, our enemy is he who put to death Jesus Christ ; and whom our beloved Master, in His divine gentleness, never ceased to pursue with His divine indignation.

“Above all,” said He to His apostles, “beware of ‘the leaven of the Pharisees. . . . Woe unto ‘you, Lawyers ! for ye have taken away the key of ‘knowledge ; ye entered not in yourselves, and them ‘that were entering in ye hindered. . . . Woe ‘unto you, Pharisees ! for ye shut up the kingdom of ‘heaven against men ; for ye neither go in yourself, ‘neither suffer ye them that are entering to go in.”¹

But Jesus Christ is the King of Ages, the Head and Principle of the mighty progress of the human race. He gives to His Church the key of knowledge, He gives to it the keys of heaven, and He will bring into His kingdom the men whom the enemy desires to hinder from entering in.

¹ S. Luke, xii. 1.—S. Luke, xi. 52.—S. Matthew, xxiii. 13.

APPENDIX.

PAULUS, EPISCOPUS SERVUS SERVORUM DEI.¹

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.

Cum ex apostolatus officio nobis, meritis licet imparibus, divinitus credito, cura Domini gregis Nobis immineat generalis, et exinde teneamur pro fidei illius custodia, et salubri directione, more Vigilis Pastoris, assidue vigilare, et attentius providere, ut qui hac ætate, peccatis exigentibus, propriæ prudentiæ innitentes, scientius et perniciosius solito, contra orthodoxæ fidei disciplinam insurgunt, et superstitiosis, ac fictitiis adinventionibus sacrarum Scripturarum intelligentiam pervertentes, catholicæ Ecclesiæ unitatem, et inconsultilem Domini tunicam scindere moliuntur, ab ovili Christi repellantur, nec magisterium erroris continent, qui discipuli veritatis esse contemnunt.

§ (1). Nos considerantes rem hujusmodi adeo gra-

¹ Bullarum, privilegiorum ac diplomatum Romanorum Pontificum. . . .
Hieronymi Minardi Romæ, MDCCXLV. Tomus quartus, pars prima, p. 354.

vem, et periculosam esse, ut Pontifex Romanus, qui Dei et Domini nostri Jesu Christi vices gerit in terris, et super gentes, et regna plenitudinem obtinet potestatis, omnesque judicat, a nemine in hoc sæculo judicandus, possit, si deprehendatur a fide devius, redargui, et quod ubi majus intenditur periculum ibi est plenius, et diligentius, consulendum, ne pseudoprophetæ aut alii etiam sæcularem jurisdictionem habentes, simplicium animas miserabiliter illaqueent, innumerabilesque populos eorum, in spiritualibus aut temporalibus, curæ et regimini commissos, secum in perditionem, et damnationis interitum trahant, nec aliquando contingat nos abominationem desolationis, quæ dicta est a Daniele propheta, in loco sancto videre, cupientes, quantum cum Deo possumus, pro nostro munere pastoralis vulpes vineam Domini demoliri satagentes capere, et rupo ab ovilibus arcere, ne canes muti videamur nequeunt latrare, et perdamur cum malis agricolis, ac mercenario comparemur.

§ (2). Habita super his cum venerabilibus fratribus nostris S. R. E., cardinalibus deliberatione matura, de eorum consilio, et unanimi assensu, omnes et singulas excommunicationis suspensionis et interdicti, ac privationis, et quasvis alias sententias, censuras, et pœnas a quibusvis Romanis pontificibus prædecessoribus nostris, aut pro talibus habitis, etiam per eorum litteras extravagantes, seu sacris conciliis ab Ecclesia Dei receptis, vel sanctorum Patrum decretis, et statutis, aut sacris Canonibus, ac constitutionibus, et ordinationibus apos-

tolicis contra hæreticos, aut schismaticos quomodolibet latas et promulgatas, apostolica auctoritate approbamus, et innovamus, ac perpetuo observari, et in vividi observantia, si forsitan in ea non sint, reponi, et esse debere necnon quoscumque, qui hactenus a fide catholica deviasse, aut in aliquam hæresim incident, aut schisma incurrent, vel excitabunt, seu committent, et deviasse, seu incidisse, aut incurrisse vel excitasse, seu commisisse deprehendentur, aut confitebuntur, seu convincentur, cujuscumque status, gradus, ordinis, conditionis, et præ eminentiæ existant, etiam Episcopali, Archiepiscopali, Patriarchali, Primitiali, aut alia majori dignitate Ecclesiastica, seu Cardinalatus honore, et Apostolicæ Sedis, ubivis locorum, tam perpetuæ quam temporalis legationis munere, vel mundana etiam Comitali, Baronali, Marchionali, Ducali, Regia et Imperiali auctoritate, seu excellentia præfulgeant, et eorum quemlibet sententias, censuras, et pœnas prædictas incurrere volumus atque decernimus.

§ (3). Et nihilominus considerantes dignum esse, ut qui virtutis amore a malis non abstinent, metu pœnarum ab illis deterreantur, et quod Episcopi, Archiepiscopi, Patriarchæ, Primate, Cardinales, Legati, Comites, Barones, Marchiones, Duces, Reges et Imperatores, qui alios docere et illis bono exemplo, ut in fide catholica contineantur, esse debent, prævaricando gravius cæteris peccant, cum non solum seipsos perdant, verum etiam alios innumerabiles populos eorum curæ, et regimini creditos, seu alias eis subditos,

secum in perditionem, in puteum interitus trahant, de similibus consilio, et assensu, *hac nostra in perpetuum valitura constitutione*, in odium tanti criminis, quo nullum in Ecclesia Dei majus, aut perniciosius esse potest, *de apostolicæ potestatis plenitudine sancimus, statuimus, decernimus et definimus*, quod sententiis, censuris et pænis prædictis in suo robore, et efficacia remanentibus, ac effectum suum sortientibus, omnes, et singuli Episcopi, Archiepiscopi, Patriarchæ, Primates, Cardinales, Legati, Comites, Barones, Marchiones, Duces, Reges et Imperatores, qui hactenus, ut præfertur, deviasse, aut in hæresim incidisse, seu schisma incurrisse, excitasse vel commisisse deprehensi, aut confessi, aut convicti fuerint, et in posterum deviabunt, aut in hæresim incident, seu schisma incurrent, vel excitabunt, aut committent, et deviasse, seu in hæresim incidisse, seu schisma incurrisse, aut excitasse, seu commisisse deprehendentur, aut confitebuntur, seu convincentur, cum in hoc inexcusabiliores ceteris reddantur, ultra sententias, censuras et pænas prædictas, sint etiam eo ipso, absque aliquo juris, aut facti ministerio, suis ordinibus, et cathedralibus etiam metropolitanis Patriarchalibus, et Primatibus Ecclesiis, ac Cardinalatus honore, et cujusvis Legationis munere, necnon voce activa, et passiva, omnique auctoritate, ac monasteriis, beneficiis, et officiis ecclesiasticis, cum cura, et sine cura, sæcularibus, et quorumvis ordinum regularibus, quæ ex quibusvis concessionibus, et dispensationibus apostolicis in titulum, commendam et administratorem, aut alias quomodolibet obtinuerint,

et in quibus, vel ad quæ jus aliquod habuerint, necnon quibusvis fructibus, redditibus, et proventibus annuis super similibus fructibus, redditibus, et proventibus eis reservatis, et assignatis, Comitatibus quoque Baroniis, Marchionatibus, Ducatibus, Regnis et Imperio, penitus, et in totum perpetuo privati, et ad illa de cetero inhabiles, et incapaces; *HABEANTUR PRO RELAPSIS*, et subversis in omnibus et per omnia, *perinde ac si prius hærisim hujusmodi in judicio publice abjurassent*, nec ullo unquam tempore ad eorum pristinum statum, aut Cathedrales, Metropolitanas, Patriarchales et Primatiales Ecclesias, seu Cardinalatus, vel alium honorem aut quamvis aliam majorem, vel minorem dignitatem, seu vocem activam, vel passivam, aut auctoritatem, seu Monasteria, et beneficia, vel Comitatus, Baronias, Marchionatus, Ducatus, Regna et Imperium restitui, reponi, reintegrari, aut rehabilitari possint; *quinimo sæcularis relinquantur arbitrio potestatis animadversione debita puniendi*, nisi apparentibus in eis veræ pænitiæ indiciiis, et condignæ pænitiæ fructibus, ex ipsius sedis benignitate, et clementia in aliquo monasterio, aut alio regulari loco ad peragendum perpetuam in pane doloris, et aqua mæstitiæ pænitentiam retrudendi fuerint. Quodque pro talibus ab omnibus cujuscumque status, gradus, ordinis, conditionis, et præëminentiae existentibus, ac quacumque etiam Episcopali, Archiepiscopali, Patriarchali, et Primatiali, aut alia majori ecclesiastica dignitate, et etiam Cardinalatus honore, seu mundana etiam Comituali, Baronali, Marchionali, Ducali, Regia et Imperiali

auctoritate, et excellentia pollentibus haberi, tractari, et reputari *et ut tales evitari, omnique humanitatis solatio destitui debeant.*

§ (4). Et qui jus patronatus, aut nominandi personas idoneas ad Cathedrales, etiam Metropolitanas et Patriarchales, ac Primatiales Ecclesias, seu Monasteria, vel alia beneficia ecclesiastica, per privationem hujus modi vacantia habere prætenderint, ne illa diutinæ vacationis exponantur incommodis, sed de servitute hæreticorum erepta personis concedantur idoneis quæ illarum populos in semitas justitiæ fideliter dirigant, teneantur, ad Ecclesias, Monasteria et beneficia hujusmodi alias personas idoneas infra tempus a jure, vel ex eorum concordatis, seu compactatis cum dicta Sede initis statutum, Nobis seu pro tempore existenti Romano Pontifici, præsentare ; alioquin tempore hujusmodi elapso plena, et libera Ecclesiarum, Monasteriorum, et Beneficiorum prædictorum dispositio ad Nos, et Romanum Pontificem prædictum eo ipso pleno jure devolvatur.

§ (5). Et insuper qui ipsos sic deprehensos aut confessos, vel convictos scienter quomodolibet receptare, vel defendere, aut eis favere, vel credere, seu eorum dogmata dogmatizare præsumpserint, sententiam excommunicationis ex ipso incurrant, efficianturque infames, nec voce, persona, scriptis, vel nuntio aut procuratore aliquo ad publica, seu privata officia, aut consilia, seu Synodum vel Concilium generale, vel

provinciale, nec conclave Cardinalium, aut aliquam fidelium congregationem, seu electionem alicujus, aut testimonium perhibendum admittantur, nec admitti possint: sint etiam intestabiles, nec ad hæreditatis successionem accedant, nullus præterea cogatur eis super aliquo negotio respondere. Quod si forsitan iudices extiterint, eorum sententiæ nullam obtineant firmitatem, nec aliquæ causæ ad eorum audientiam deducantur, et si fuerint advocati, eorum patrocinium nullatenus recipiatur, si vero Tabelliones extiterint, instrumenta confecta per eos nullius sint penitus roboris vel momenti. Et insuper clerici omnibus et singulis Ecclesiis, etiam Cathedralibus, Metropolitanis, Patriarchalibus, et Primatialibus ac dignitatibus, Monasteriis, beneficiis, et officiis Ecclesiasticis, etiam ut præfertur, qualificatis per eos quomodolibet obtentis, et tam ipsi, quam laici, etiam, ut præmittitur, qualificati, et dignitatibus prædictis præditi quibuscumque Regnis, Ducatibus, Dominiis, Feudis et bonis temporalibus per eos possessis privati existant eo ipso, Regnaque, Ducatus, Dominia, Feuda, et bona hujusmodi publicentur, *et publica sint efficianturque juris, et proprietatis eorum*, QUI ILLA PRIMO OCCUPAVERINT, si in sinceritate fidei, et unitate S. R. E. ac sub nostra, et successorum nostrorum Romanorum Pontificum cononice intransium obedientia fuerint.

§ (6). Adjicientes quod si ullo unquam tempore apparuerit aliquem Episcopum etiam pro Archiepiscopo seu Patriarcha, vel Primate se gerentem, aut prædictæ

Romanæ Ecclesiæ Cardinalem, etiam ut præfertur, Legatum, seu etiam Romanum Pontificem ante ejus promotionem vel in Cardinalem, seu Romanum Pontificem assumptionem a fide catholica deviasse, aut in aliquam hæresim incidisse, promotio, seu assumptio de eo etiam in concordiam, et de unanimi omnium cardinalium assensu facta, nulla, irrita, et inanis existat, nec per susceptionem muneris, consecrationis aut subsecutam regiminis, et administrationis possessionem, seu quasi, vel ipsius Romani Pontificis inthronizationem, aut adorationem, seu ei præstitam ab omnibus obedientiam, et cujusvis temporis in præmissis eorum convaluisse dici, aut convalescere possit, nec pro legitima in aliqua sui parte habeatur, nullamque talibus in Episcopos, seu Archiepiscopos vel Patriarchas aut Primates promotis, seu in Cardinales, vel Romanum Pontificem assumptis, in spiritualibus, vel temporalibus administrandi facultatem tribuisse aut tribuere censeatur, sed omnia et singula per eos quomodolibet dicta, facta, gesta et administrata, ac inde secuta quæcumque viribus caveant, et nullam prorsus firmitatem, nec jus alicui tribuant, sintque ipsi sic promoti, et assumpti, eo ipso absque aliqua desuper facienda declaratione, omni dignitate, loco, honore, titulo, auctoritate, officio et potestate privati, liceatque omnibus, et singulis sic promotis, et assumptis, si in fide antea non deviasent, nec hæretici fuissent, neque schisma incurrissent, aut excitassent, vel commisissent.

§ (7). Subditis personis, tam Clericis Sæcularibus,

et Regularibus quam etiam Laicis necnon Cardinalibus, etiam qui electioni ipsius Pontificis antea a fide devii, aut hæretici, seu schismatici interfuerint, seu alias consenserint et ei obedientiam præstiterint, eumque adoraverint, ac Castellanis, Præfectis, Capitaneis, et Officialibus etiam Almæ Urbis nostræ, et totius status ecclesiastici, etiam eisdem sic promotis, vel assumptis homagio, seu juramento, vel cautione obligatis et obnoxiiis, ac ipsorum sic promotorum, vel assumptorum, obedientia, et devotione impune quodcumque cedere, eosque ut magos, ethnicos, publicanos, et hæresiarchas evitare, eisdem subditis personis fidelitati, et obedientiæ futurorum Episcoporum, Archiepiscoporum, Patriarcharum, Primatum, Cardinalium, et Romani Pontificis canonice intrantis nihilominus adstrictis remanentibus et ad majorem ipsorum sic promotorum, et assumptorum, si eorum regimen, et administrationem continuare voluerint, confusionem, contra eosdem sic promotos et assumptos, auxilium brachii sæcularis implorare, nec propterea ab ipsorum sic promotorum, et assumptorum fidelitate, et obedientia, præmissorum occasione recedentes, tanquam tunicæ Domini scissores aliquarum censurarum, seu pœnarum ultioni subiaceant.

§ (8). Non obstantibus Constitutionibus et Ordinationibus Apostolicis, necnon privilegiis, indultis, et litteris Apostolicis eisdem Episcopis, Archiepiscopis, Patriarchis, Primatibus et Cardinalibus, ac quibusvis aliis sub quibuscumque tenoribus, et formis ac cum

quibusvis clausulis, et decretis, etiam motu proprio, et de certa scientia, ac de apostolicæ potestatis plenitudine seu etiam consistorialiter, aut alias quomodolibet concessis, et etiam iteratis vicibus approbatis, innovatis, ac etiam in corpore juris clausis, necnon quibusvis capitulis, conclavis, etiam juramento, aut confirmatione apostolica, vel quavis firmitate alia roboratis, et per nos ipsos juratis. Quibus omnibus eorum tenores præsentibus pro expressis, ac de verbo ad verbum insertis habentes, illis alias in suo robore permansuris, hac vice dumtaxat specialiter, et expresse derogamus, ceterisque contrariis quibuscumque.

§ (9). Ut autem præsentis literæ ad omnium quorum interest, notitiam deducantur, volumus eas, seu earum transumptum (cui manu notarii publici subscripto, et sigillo alicujus personæ in dignitate ecclesiastica constitutæ munito, plenam fidem adhiberi debere decernimus) in Basilicæ Principis Apostolorum de Urbe, et Chancelleriæ apostolicæ valvis, atque in acie campi Floræ per aliquos ex cursoribus nostris publicari, et affigi, earumque copiam inibi affixam dimitti, publicationemque affixionem, et copiæ affixæ dimissionem hujusmodi sufficere, et pro solemnem et legitimam haberi, nec aliam publicationem requiri, aut expectari debere.

§ (10). Nulli ergo omnino hominum liceat hanc paginam nostræ approbationis, innovationis, sanctionis, statuti, derogationis voluntatem, decretorum infringere, vel ei ausu temerario contraire. Si quis autem hoc

attentare præsumpserit, indignationem omnipotentis Dei, ac Beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum ejus se noverit incursum.

Datum Romæ, apud Sanctum Petrum anno Incarnationis Dominicæ millesimo quinquagesimo nono, XV. Kal. Martii. Pont. nostri anno IV.

- † Ego PAULUS, catholicæ Ecclesiæ episcopus.
- † Ego Jo. BELLAYUS, episcopus Ostiens.
- † Ego R. card. DE CORPO, episcopus Portuen.
- † Ego F. card. PISANUS, episcopus Tusculan.
- † Ego Fed., card. COESIUS, episcopus Prænest.
- † Ego P., card. , episcopus Albanen.
- †
- † Ego R., card. SANCTI-ANGELI, major Pænit.
- † Ego T., card. CRISPUS.
- † Ego FULVIUS, card. Perusinus.
- † Ego Jos MICH., card. Saracenus.
- † Ego Jos., card. Sancti Vitalis.
- † Ego JA., card. Puteus.
- † Ego HIER., card. Imolen.
- † Ego B., card. Tranen.
- † Ego DIOMEDES, card. Arianen.
- † Ego SCIPIO, card. Pesarum.
- † Jos., card. Roumanus.
- † Jos. ANTONIUS, card. Sancti Pancratii.
- † Ego TH., card. Gaddus.
- † Ego VIRG., card. de Spoleto.
- † Ego F. M., card. Alexan.
- † Ego CLE. MOLIANUS, card. Aræc.

- † Ego G., As. Diac, card. Cam.
- † Ego H., card. de Sermoneta.
- † Ego Jo., card. Sabellus.
- † Ego HIER., card. Sancti Gorgii.
- † Ego IRM., card. de Monte.
- † Ego ALOY., card. Cornelius.
- † Ego C., card. Carafa.
- † Ego ALFON., card. Neapolis.
- † Ego VITELLOTIUS, card. Vitellius.
- † Ego Jo. BAPTISTA, card. Consiliarius.

(Locus Signi),

Dominus mihi adjutor.

[*Authorised Translation.*]

M^{GR.} THE BISHOP OF ORLEANS,

AND

M^{GR.} THE ARCHBISHOP OF MALINES.

FOURTH LETTER

TO

MONSEIGNEUR DECHAMPS,

BY

A. GRATRY,

Prêtre de l'Oratoire, Membre de l'Académie Française.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH BY

T. J. BAILEY, B.A.,

Priest of the Church of England.

LONDON:

J. T. HAYES, LYALL PLACE.

SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, AND CO., PATERNOSTER ROW.

BRIGHTON: G. WAKELING.

[*All rights reserved.*]

It is understood that this letter, like all my other works, simply represents the opinion of the author, and does not bind the Oratoire in any way.

A. GRATRY,

Priest of the Oratoire,

Member of the Academy.

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE.

As several of the translations, of which the Latin text is given, are not strictly literal, I think it right to state that the translations are made from the French of Father Gratry, and not exclusively from the Latin.

T. J. B.

PREFACE.¹

So long as I only heard raised against me "the shrill and fierce cries" of a few Journalists, I did not pay any attention to them, but in silence and patience allowed the torrent of falsehoods, insults, and calumnies to pass by. But now that learning, now that lawful authority intervene, I determine to do as follows.

I am obedient in everything to the authority of the Church, according to my duty and my faith. This there was no need for me to say. As to learning, I have already declared that I will gratefully accept every true criticism, come whence it may. I will hasten to do it justice, and to correct myself. All the replies, learned or courteous, well-founded or not, which have already reached me, I have gathered together, to make use of profitably. With still greater reason will I accept, within the limits of my consci-

¹This Preface has already appeared, in part, in the *Gazette de France* of March 12, 1870. The letter itself would have followed more quickly, had I not lost five weeks' work from illness. This also has prevented my replying to numerous letters, often excellent, which for some time past have been addressed to me; to which, however, I hope to give satisfaction by the present reply.

ence, the corrections which might come from a Bishop, even although this Bishop should have no direct authority over me.

But if even a Bishop should draw from my words different and illegitimate consequences, in order to blame me for them, I should protest with energy and respect. I should simply reassert that which I meant to say ; and if my meaning were not sufficiently clear, I should correct it.

For example. I said that the lowest of men can and do receive orders from God ; and that I have myself received them in my reason, in my conscience, and in my faith. This is true. But if they endeavour to deduce from this, "that I arrogate to myself in the ' Church a mission to teach, different from that which ' flows from hierarchical authority," I protest against it, and I say, that such a consequence is in no way contained in my meaning, and that in any case such a thought has never entered my mind.

Another example. I compared the policy of the Church to the earthen vessel which bears the treasure of the faith. I believe with Mgr. Dechamps that "the infallibility of the Church, or of the Pope, would ' be neither infallibility in government, nor infallibility in matters which do not belong to the faith, ' nor infallibility in acts which are not definitions ' of faith."¹ I began to think I could attribute to faults, to imperfections in the policy of the Church, many misfortunes, divisions, hindrances in

¹ Lettre de Mgr. Dechamps to Mgr. Dupanloup, p. 13.

the propagation of the faith ; which, moreover, is shewn to be so by history. But if it is thought that this assertion amounts to saying openly that the Church has been “unfaithful to a part of her mission,” I protest again, and I affirm that I never thought, or said, or appeared to say anything of the kind.

As to the school of falsehood and error of which I have spoken, I maintain what I have said respecting it. I have a right to call *a falsehood* the forged decretals and the forgeries of the Greek *Thesaurus*. I have a right to call *an error* the use which men of good faith, and even saints, have made of these false documents which they thought true.

And as for those who dare to say that I insult the Roman Church, they commit an iniquity. In my first letter, speaking of the falsifications of the sixteenth century, I said : “Neither the Papacy, nor the Church, nor God, have desired a falsehood” (p. 77) ; and as to the forgeries of the *Thesaurus*, I have shewn that neither Pope Urban IV., nor the genius and holiness of S. Thomas Aquinas, were able to suspect them. —Then, in my Second Letter (p. 62), I wrote thus : “I declare, and I believe I have already declared, that ‘I only accuse of falsehood and fraud two men of whose names I am ignorant, namely the Pseudo-Isidore, and the author of the Greek *Thesaurus*.’” But even were I to accuse of falsehood one or many men, be they who they may, would that be accusing the Roman Church ?

I add, that I maintain as perfectly true and orthodox

the fundamental theses which I have proved in my Letters. I maintain them with so much the more determination, since, for the last four months, the most violent efforts of a number of writers to destroy them have only issued, through their irreparable weakness, in proving their impregnable strength. This will be seen in this Fourth Letter.

After which, I shall reach at length, I hope, that last work which I long so much to publish to the glory of the Catholic Church and of the centre of unity, Holy Church and Sacred Centre, which so many internal enemies, leagued, it seems, with those without, are endeavouring now to dishonour.

Lastly, since the most cowardly calumnies are uttered with respect to my Catholic belief, I repeat that, by the grace of God, I have the happiness of an increasing faith : "*Domine adauge nobis fidem.*" I do not admit that there is at this present time a single man living who is more convinced than I am, of the grand and divine truth of Christianity and Catholicism. I have but one ambition upon the earth, which is, that God will deign to preserve for me, until the hour of my death, this incomparable happiness, which has been that of my whole life.

This being laid down, I add that, in this discussion, during this long time that my adversaries have been talking alone and without contradiction, they have so utterly bewildered themselves with their own words, with the number of voices, with the mass and inten-

sity of the cries, that they imagine they have replied somewhat to my Letters, and even suppressed them.

For the last month, I have been doing all in my power to learn their objections, in order to correct all the errors which should have been pointed out to me. My present Letter is, partly, an investigation into and a discussion upon the errors which they attribute to me. It is, above all, a new study executed immediately upon, and simultaneously with, the proceedings of the school of error, whose morality I make known.

FOURTH LETTER.

I.

My three principal adversaries, without despising the others, are Mgr. Dechamps, Dom Guéranger, and M. de Margerie.

My first Letters, as well as this, reply to Mgr. Dechamps. I am well aware that the Bishop of Orleans, by the masterly work which all Europe has read with admiration, leaves nothing to be said with respect to the Letters of Mgr. the Archbishop of Malines.

I shall, however, say a few words more respecting them, and I begin by calling to account this Third Letter, in which Mgr. Dechamps inserts at full length a small work of Dom Guéranger, and addresses it to me in these words: "The idea has struck me of 'addressing you myself, or rather of inflicting upon 'you that which Dom Guéranger has just written to 'you.'"

Behold me, then, sent back by Mgr. Dechamps to Dom Guéranger. Of all the writers who attack me,

this is the one whom they oppose to me as the most learned and most formidable. Let us see what his learning has produced against me, and how he visits upon my errors the chastisement which Mgr. the Archbishop of Malines inflicts upon me.

I beg the reader not to think unworthy of his attention these disputes of details and of passages. The question is to know whether, perhaps, under the punctilious appearance of these passages and these details, we shall not see strange and formidable phenomena put in force, full of dangers and threats for the Catholic Church, and for the religion of mankind.

II.

First fault discovered by Dom Guéranger in my Letters.

“*For want of knowing what he is speaking about,*
 ‘Father Gratry puts forth as inviolable . . . a
 ‘Roman Breviary anterior to that of Pius V. *Let*
 ‘*him learn then,* that if, before 1568, a book had
 ‘existed, entitled, *Roman Breviary*, this book not
 ‘being supported by the assent of any Pope, not being
 ‘guaranteed by any *bull* or *brief*, was at the mercy of
 ‘the first copyist or the first printer to whom it
 ‘pleased to insert in it that which seemed good to
 ‘him.”¹

Could any one believe that a man who takes this

¹ Dom Guéranger, *Première Brochure*, p. 24.

tone does not know what he says, and is mistaken in a ridiculous manner ?

In truth, here is my reply. I have before me two Roman Breviaries anterior to 1568 ; the one of 1542, and the other of 1536. Both are provided with a brief of Paul III., *Sub Annulo Piscatoris*. Here, then, are Breviaries guaranteed by *briefs* before the year 1568, before the Breviary of Saint Pius V.¹

What becomes of the lesson which they wished to give me ?

But let us look at the matter a little closer.

The brief of 1536 does not permit the first comer to treat this Breviary as he likes, since it grants a privilege of sale and printing. The second brief, given for a subsequent edition, is more developed, and forbids any printer except those privileged, to print this Breviary under pain of fine and even of excommunication.

Here, then, is a Breviary very energetically protected.

Our author knows all this very well.

But is it not, moreover, absurd in itself to affirm that, up to 1568, neither more nor less, there was no authentic Roman Breviary, and that the divine office was given over at Rome to the mercy and to the good pleasure of the copyists ? In fact, we see the contrary by this Breviary which Paul III. puts forth : *Breviarium Romanum a Paulo tertio promulgatum*. But it is sufficient to open a theological dictionary to

¹ Voir à la Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève. *Breviarium Romanum a Paulo III. recens promulgatum*. B.B. 67. *Breviarium Romanum nuper reformatum*. B.B. 70.

see in it,—that which was certain before-hand,—that at no time, at Rome, was the divine office given over to anarchy ; that, for instance, from the thirteenth century (1241) “the abbreviation undertaken by the ‘general of the Franciscan Minorites, Haymon, obtained ‘the approval of Pope Gregory IX., and was introduced by Pope Nicholas III. in all the Churches of ‘Rome.”¹

This is a very serious accusation brought here by Dom Guéranger against the Roman Church. As for myself, when I accuse *the unknown scribe* who has mutilated the office of S. Leo and several others, the accusation is directed neither against all the Popes, nor against any Pope ; by a still stronger reason, it could not reach the Roman Church. The accusation of Dom Guéranger, on the contrary, supposes in the whole Roman Church, until 1568, the most disordered anarchy and the most guilty carelessness in matters liturgical. They imagine such a disorder to have existed from the earliest centuries until after the Council of Trent ! I think I have much more respect for the Roman Church than such a defender.

III.

Second error of which my critic affirms me to be guilty.

“Father Gratry speaks of a Breviary of the ‘seventh century. He must be more than a stranger

¹Goschler. *Dictionnaire Encyclopédique de la Théologie Catholique.* Article Bréviaire.

‘to all acquaintance with ecclesiastical antiquity to
 ‘talk about a Breviary of the seventh century. Every-
 ‘body knows that that which we call the Breviary is
 ‘not anterior to the eleventh century.”¹ Very well!
 But let us have recourse again to the same elementary
 source, the *Dictionary of Theology*.² At the article
 ‘Breviary,’ this is what I read: “The most important
 ‘for us is the Roman Breviary, the drawing up of
 ‘which is due to Leo the Great (fifth century), to
 ‘Gelasius (fifth century), to S. Gregory the Great
 ‘(sixth and seventh centuries).”

Now, since the three Popes to whom is due the
 drawing up of the Roman Breviary are of the fifth,
 sixth, and seventh centuries, I have the right, it seems,
 to admit the existence of this Breviary in the seventh
 century. But let us open the *Institutions Liturgiques*
 of Dom Guéranger himself. To whom is due, accord-
 ing to him, “the commencement of the liturgical work
 ‘. . . . the first careful preparation of the Divine
 ‘Office,” if not to these Popes of the fifth, sixth, and
 seventh centuries, “the Leos, the Gelasii, the Gre-
 gories?”³

Besides, at the end of a chapter consecrated to the
 history of the Liturgy during the fifth and sixth cen-
 turies, I read this conclusion: “The result of the facts
 ‘announced in the present chapter is, . . . that *the*
 ‘*definitive drawing up* of the different Liturgies, prin-

¹ Dom Guéranger, first Treatise, p. 24. I do not suppose that Dom Guéranger
 wished to play upon the word *Breviary*, meaning *abbreviation*.

² Dictionnaire Goschler.

³ *Institutions Liturgiques*, t. 1, p. 377.

‘cipally in the West, dates from the fifth or sixth
 ‘centuries, namely, the Roman, by S. Gelasius and
 ‘S. Gregory the Great.”¹ Why does Dom Guéranger
 bring forward against me the contrary to that which
 he prints in his *Institutions Liturgiques*?

IV.

Third error: stranger yet than the others.

“Father Gratry lays to the account of the Roman
 ‘Breviary the legend of S. Agatho. . . . Now *it*
 ‘*is easy to make sure of the fact* that S. Agatho has
 ‘neither office nor commemoration in the Breviary.
 ‘. . . No, . . . the Breviary does not con-
 ‘tain the office of S. Agatho; *the thing is easily*
 ‘*verified.*”²

Let us verify it, then. I open my Roman Breviary,
 and there I find the office of S. Agatho and the
 legend in question. I have the edition at this
 moment the best known in France, the beautiful
 edition of Mame (Tours, 1859). Dom Guéranger is
 perfectly aware that this legend is found in the Roman
 Breviary. Why does he maintain the contrary?
 Because the office of S. Agatho is found at the end of
 the volume, in the supplement, and forms a Particular
 Proper. But, whether this Office be or be not a
 Particular Proper, be it of obligation or permissive, is
 the office the less in the Roman Breviary?

Why, then, maintain that it is not there, since it is

¹ Institut. Liturg., tom. 1 p. 158.

² Dom Guéranger, first Treatise, pp. 28 and 29.

there, and since 1686 it was approved by the Pope? But this, in any case, decides the question; the Office of which we are speaking is found, as I said (1st Letter, p. 75), in the *Proper of the Roman Clergy, Officia pro Clero Romano*. It is, then, the part twice Roman, the part *Romano-Roman* of the Breviary, which, to support his thesis, Dom Guéranger declares is not in any way found in the Roman Breviary, and in no way forms a part of this Breviary! And twice over he begs urgently the public to verify the fact with their own eyes. The public thus brought to a stop, understands perfectly well that it would be superfluous to verify a thing so evident and so easy to verify; and my friends themselves understand with regret that I made a mistake upon so grave a matter.

But no, the Office is really in the Roman Breviary, in the most Roman part of the Breviary: in the Offices for the Roman Clergy. It is my critic alone who is mistaken, or at least who pretends not to know what is there. If he had been willing to say what is there, he would have said: "Yes, undoubtedly, the office of S. Agatho is found in the Roman Breviary. It is found in the Proper of the Roman Clergy. It was approved by Pope Innocent XI., in 1686. But it is not of obligation for every one." After this, Dom Guéranger, since he was determined to do so, was fully at liberty to conclude thus: "Therefore the Office of S. Agatho is not in the Roman Breviary." But then, every reader would have been able to appreciate the value of such an argument.

V.

Another example : continuation of the former.

“The legend of S. Agatho, which Father Gratry ‘has entitled a forgery, does nothing,” says again Dom ‘Guéranger, “but express the purest historical truth.”¹

The legend says : “That the VI. Council condemned ‘the same errors and the same persons whom Agatho ‘had condemned.” Now Agatho condemns Theodore of Pharan, Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter of Constantinople, with all their followers ; and the Council condemns Theodore of Pharan, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter, and, moreover, Honorius, and Cyrus, and Macarius, with his disciple Stephen. Are these two lists identical ? No, undoubtedly, since there are three more names in the list of the Council, namely, Honorius, Macarius, Stephen. We must, then, admit that the legend of S. Agatho omits the name of Honorius, which the text of the Council gives. Now, Honorius was then, as in the present day, the great question.

And not only does the legend of S. Agatho omit the name of Honorius, but it adds these words : “Agatho has declared in express terms that until now ‘all the Popes who have preceded him, have been ‘free from every kind of error :” “*Antecessores suos ‘ab omni erroris labe immunes hucusque fuisse expres- ‘sis verbis declaravit.*” These words of the false legend, very different moreover from the text of Agatho, aim at establishing that Agatho had no

¹ Dom Guéranger, first Letter, p. 29.

thought in any way of condemning Honorius, since he justifies him *in express terms*; hence that the Council did not condemn Honorius, since it limits itself to condemning the same persons whom Agatho condemns. Now the Council condemns Honorius.

All this legend is, then, a deception and a manifest forgery.

Dom Guéranger knows these facts, and does not deny them.

“But the legend,” says he, “is no less a pure historical truth.” How can this be? For the delicate reason as follows: “*Was it necessary* to speak of Honorius ‘whose name Agatho did not mention, and to relate ‘events which only took place after the death of this ‘Pope?’”¹

What are these events which only took place after the death of Agatho? The condemnation of Honorius and the others took place on March 28, 681. The end of the Council was September 6, 681. And the death of Agatho January 10, 682. Here, then, is an argument founded entirely upon a mistake in chronology.

Let us look, moreover, into this singular mode of argument itself. Whether the condemnation of Honorius were anterior or posterior to the death of Agatho, how could it follow that it should not be spoken of, whilst all the others are spoken of? All are at the same moment, the same instant, in the same text. This profound and decisive word (“was it necessary”)

¹ Dom Guéranger, first Treatise, p. 29.

is applicable to all, or to none. Here, then, we have a mutilation of the text justified by a word ("was it necessary") absolutely void of meaning.

There is in it a non-sense so absolute, such a mixture of *finesse* and absurdity, that it is very difficult to lay down what the author means. For what, I ask you, does he mean to say? Or rather, what is it he meant to do? Is there anything here than one of those stratagems of war, sometimes employed in the lower kind of literature, which consists in boldly hurling forth a group of words, known to be void of meaning, but which they think sufficient to throw into confusion the attention of the public? ¹

And it is after such a tissue of playings upon words, and pitiable subterfuges; after the audacious denial of a fact which each one can establish with his own eyes, namely, the presence in the Roman Breviary of the Office of S. Agatho; after the mutilation of passages, justified by the word "was it necessary;" it is after all this, and bearing upon this even, that Dom Guéranger speaks thus: "When Father Gratry returns to his senses, we may well believe that he will regret so many calumnies against the whole Church."

¹ *A-propos* of this legend, M. de Margerie (1st Letter, p. 61) imagines that they "made use of the *incontestable right of choosing* amongst the names of the heretics 'condemned, not to leave room in this book . . . for a fact which is a 'stumbling-block to every reader who does not clear it up by a laborious 'research.'" I reply, that our first duty is not to alter the truth, and not to falsify history, as they did, in saying: "Agathonis igitur Auctoritate . . . Iidem 'Errantes damnati sunt."

Well! since they employ the word 'calumny,' let us say a few words upon it.

I say, first, that the work of Dom Guéranger is nothing from beginning to end but a travesty of what I wrote.

I say that the title of the work, "*Defence of the Roman Church against the Accusations of Father Gratry,*" is a calumnious title. The calumny is further aggravated by this expression: "He will regret so many calumnies *against the whole Church.*" Dom Guéranger is well aware that I have attacked neither the Roman Church, nor the whole Church; and that, in attacking the legends of the Breviary, one attacks neither the Roman Church, nor the whole Church.

He ought, at all events, to know it, since he himself, in his *Institutions Liturgiques*, having to judge the reform of the Breviary, inspired and approved by Leo X., Clement VII., and Paul III., was not afraid to affirm, "that it was a disastrous reform, to which the 'whole past of the Liturgy was sacrificed.'" Must we say that, thus expressing himself, he insulted the Roman Church, and calumniated the Universal Church?

This is how he defends himself: "If, now, we allow 'ourselves to judge so severely a work which belongs 'to several Roman Pontiffs, since it was accomplished 'under their inspiration, it is not surely that we are 'resolved to accept always as the best all that comes 'from the Supreme See!'"¹ What is the meaning of these

¹ Institut. Liturg. t. 1. p. 377.

phrases? One does not accept *as the best* that which is considered *disastrous*.

But one has not for that blasphemed the Roman Church, nor the whole Church.

I have called '*cowardly calumnies*' the lying accusations maintained against me on this point. My devotion to the Roman Church, and to the whole Church, is truer than that of these false witnesses who accuse me:

Because I have said, what everybody knows, that there are in the Roman Breviary false legends, as Benedict XIV. himself also said, because I point out some in the Proper of the Roman Clergy, and because I am indignant with an energetic indignation against the mutilation of passages, behold them denying with determination facts which our own eyes see, and denouncing me as guilty "of calumny against the 'whole Church!'"

I had said, however: "Are the legends the Breviary? And is the Breviary, then, the Church?" I had said, again: "Neither the Papacy, nor the Church, nor God, hath desired a falsehood."¹

Yes, it is after this, that the accuser allows himself to entitle his false witness: "*Defence of the Roman Church against the Accusations of Father Gratry.*" And he accuses me of having hurled "calumnies against the whole Church!" Dom Guéranger must permit me to be somewhat sharp upon this subject. A Priest, odiously outraged and caluminated in his

¹First Letter, p. 77.

faith, has the right, and even the duty, to disgrace the accuser and the false witnesses.

I submit to my Fathers, to my brethren in the Priesthood, I submit to every man of spirit and of honor, these iniquitous proceedings.

I add, that this audacity merits a chastisement.

The chastisement is the public statement of the fact. This I now inflict upon the guilty.

VI.

Fifth error.—I said, with Bossuet, that, in the ancient Roman Breviary, until about the seventeenth century, was read, on the feast of S. Leo, the condemnation of Honorius; and that, from the time of Clement VIII., we find that, in this same Instruction, the name of Honorius has been taken out of the midst of the names of those condemned by the Sixth Council for heresy. I quote a Breviary of 1520, which contains the condemnation of Honorius. I might quote many others, since this mutilation of the Breviary took place about the end of the sixth century.

Dom Guéranger wishes to prove,—I do not know why, and it is of little consequence to me,—that this mutilation is much earlier, and he says: “In my turn ‘I am prepared to quote Roman Breviaries, even ‘earlier than 1520, in which the legend of S. Leo ‘does not offer a word, not a single word, of the ‘passage quoted from the edition of 1520. Our ‘library at Solesmes contains two of them, which I ‘place at the disposal of Father Gratry.” (p. 25.)

These Breviaries placed at the disposal of the adversary, and in which not a word, not a single word of the passage quoted, is to be found, have a grand effect in polemics. But here is my reply. I have myself before me two Breviaries of the first part of the sixth century, which I equally place at the disposal of my contradicter, which do not contain a word, not a single word of the passage quoted. But why? Because they are Breviaries which do not in any way speak of the Sixth Council.

They do not, then, mutilate the text, since they do not say a single word about it. My contradicter, much more learned than I am in these matters, and who does not cease reminding me of his overwhelming superiority, knows all this perfectly well; and he must have smiled, when he wrote these words: "not a word, not a single word of the passage quoted."

The whole argument of Dom Guéranger, depends from beginning to end upon the employment of similar means.

I say, then, that the Breviaries which do not speak of the Sixth Council, do not alter the text, because they omit the whole. These Breviaries are, then, here out of the question. Does Dom Guéranger desire to maintain that this is also already a suppression or abbreviation tending to obliterate the whole affair of Honorius? I am willing, and I am inclined to believe it. But that is not what I intend to maintain here.

I have maintained, and I do maintain, that the an-

cient Breviaries, which contain the history of the Sixth Council, and give the names of the different heretics condemned, give all alike the name of Honorius, Pyrrhus, and the others. I have maintained, and do maintain, that the ancient Breviaries, which reproduce these condemnations, reproduce them entirely according to the *Liber Pontificalis*, without omitting the name of Honorius, whilst the new Breviaries, which also copy the *Liber Pontificalis*, always cut out of the list the name of the heretical Pope.¹

Now the abbreviator who, finding this ancient Instruction, "*In qua Synodo condemnati sunt Sergius, Cyrus, Honorius,*" &c., and who has the audacity to write in the new Breviary, "*In eo concilio Cyrus, Sergius, et Pyrrhus condemnati sunt,*" thus taking out the name of Honorius, has clearly mutilated the text. As Bossuet said, "He has erased it in the 'Roman Breviary:.'" "*In Breviario Romano hæc eraserunt.*" Now, the primitive text of the Roman Breviary, which is still to be met with in 1520, and perhaps later, is at the same time the text of the *Liber*

¹The following was written to me upon this subject by one of the Keepers of the Archives, who was good enough to make some of these researches for me:—

"I declare that the greater part of the ancient Breviaries, about twenty-five out of thirty, which are to be found in the Imperial Library, reproduce the condemnations of the Sixth Council; I declare, moreover, that in *all those* in which are found the names of the heretics condemned, there is not a single one, to my knowledge, which does not give the name of Honorius with those of all the others."

See *M.S.S. Latin*, Nos. 1340, 1288, 1289, and 1290, of the 14th century; Nos. 756, 1406, 1049, 760, 1262, &c., of the 15th century.

Pontificalis, and at the same time also the text of the *Liber Diurnus*.

I say, then, that this is a falsification and a mutilation. It is to frauds of this kind that the text from Job is applicable: “*Numquid indiget Deus mendacio vestro:*” it is to frauds of this kind that the passage from Melchior Cano is applicable, who, himself also, has recognised this tendency to falsify and to lie, in order to exalt the Roman Pontiffs; a tendency which he crushes in these terms, precisely applicable to the affair of Honorius: “Peter has no need of our falsehoods:” “*Non indiget Petrus mendacio nostro: adulatione nostra non eget.*”

If Melchior Cano thus understands the matter, how has Bossuet treated this great mutilation of the Roman Breviary? “The condemnation of Honorius,” said he, “which is found everywhere in the acts of the ‘sixth, seventh, and eighth Œcumenical Councils ‘. . . . is found likewise in the *Liber Diurnus* of ‘the Roman Pontiffs; that is to say, in their professions ‘of faith. It is found, too, in the Ancient Roman ‘Breviaries, in the Instructions of S. Leo, up to our ‘time: ‘*Idem etiam in vetustis Romanis Breviariis ‘usque ad nostrum sæculum in sancti Leonis II. vita ‘legebatur.*”¹ “Now,” says Bossuet again, “the *Liber ‘Diurnus* they hide as much as they can. In the ‘Roman Breviary they have erased the name of ‘Honorius, *in Breviario Romano hæc eraserunt.* But ‘what! have they also concealed the facts themselves?

¹ *Defensio Declarat.* l. vii., cap. xxvi., Passim.

'The truth shines forth on all sides; and the facts
'make themselves known so much the more clearly in
'proportion to their eagerness to mutilate the texts.

"And why all this? Because, to establish their
'system, they have need of these contrivances, without
'which all their thesis is lost All these
'things are but incoherent fables playing
'upon words, and not reasons. A cause is lost when
'it needs to be defended by such fictions."¹

Bossuet, like Melchior Cano, knew then perfectly
this school of falsehood and error that we see here in
action.

VII.

Sixth error.—My adversary accuses me "of *gro-*
'*tesque* anachronisms, even to making the Librarian
'Anastasius a contemporary of Pope Agatho, showing
'the most extraordinary ignorance upon the subject of
'this same Anastasius, attributing to him the lives of
'the Popes of the seventh century in the *Liber Ponti-*
'*ficalis*, when every body knows that he is only the
'author of the three last." (p. 27.) Yes, there is in
this page, which is a translation, a gross anachronism
of two centuries, made by a mistake in copying. But
if I were myself, which is not the case, the author of
this anachronism, which has *nothing to do with the*
question, what would follow from it? I should limit
myself to correcting the mistake. It is, in fact, a
correction of the proof-sheets. This has been done

¹ *Defensio Declarat.*, l. vii. cap. xxvi. Passim.

long since, several weeks before the criticism of Dom Guéranger.

As to the other error, I challenge my critic to tell me where I have written that Anastasius was the author of all the lives of the *Liber Pontificalis*. I said at the page referred to by him (1st Letter, p. 44) that Anastasius spoke of the Sixth Council as having condemned Honorius: and it is so. But Dom Guéranger thinks that this passage from Anastasius is taken from the *Liber Pontificalis*! If he had been attentive, he would have seen that the passage quoted by Father Garnier is taken, not from the *Liber Pontificalis*, but from the Letter of Anastasius to the deacon John.

It is, then, my critic who is mistaken, and not myself.

Upon which I see myself accused by him of the most extraordinary ignorance, and jeered at for a gross fault which he himself commits. The *grotesque* is on his side.

VIII.

Seventh error.—I said that the Breviaries at the commencement of the sixteenth century (for instance the Breviary of 1520), do not contain the false decretal, which I find in the new Breviary, in the Office of S. Marcel, at the commencement of the seventeenth century. This is the truth. Dom Guéranger maintains that this introduction was in

1568, and not in 1602. In what way does that injure my argument? I did not wish to blame the Breviary of Pius V., precisely because, in 1568, they might have been still ignorant of the imposture of the false decretals. I only wished to blame the edition of Clement VIII., which maintains this deplorable introduction, when Baronius had given the alarm, and others had proved the forgery of the decretals of the Pseudo-Isidore. I am then right, and my critic is wrong. If, in 1568, they had introduced this false decretal, when the forgery had only just been proved, they might still be ignorant of this quite recent proof. They could no longer be so in 1602. It is here that they were wrong; and the wrong is aggravated by the fact, that they have preserved even to our time this passage of a forger.

IX.

Eighth error.—I show the gradual development of a fable introduced in the sixteenth century into the Roman Breviary, the fable of the Council of Sinuessa. In 1520, the fable is not there. In 1536 and in 1542, in the Breviary put forth by Paul III., which, however, aims only at conciseness, and which cuts out the whole history of the Sixth Council, I see the fable in question appear. But it is not there in full; the most audacious part is omitted. Later (whether it be in 1568 or in 1602, is of little consequence), they introduced it completely. But it is the correction of 1602 that I bring forward, because the truth was

then known. "It is astonishing that such a fable 'should be still retained in the Roman Breviary,'" said in the eighteenth century the Benedictines of Saint Maur, "in the *Art of Verifying Dates*."¹ We are compelled to say the same in the nineteenth century. "It is astonishing that such a fable should be still 'preserved in the Roman Breviary.'" Dom Cellier, a true *savant*, a true Benedictine, said on this subject in his *General History of Sacred Authors*, a work approved by two briefs of Benedict XIV.:² "The 'objection that the history of the fall of Marcellinus 'and of the Council of Sinuessa is authorised by the 'Roman Breviary, is unworthy of a reply, since there 'is no one now-a-days, however little versed in 'criticism, who does not admit the forgery of a 'quantity of documents from which the Instructions 'of the Roman Breviary are composed; those, for 'example, which belong to the baptism of Constantine, 'and the donations which he made to the Roman 'Church."³

Still more, the Bollandists themselves "hope one 'day to see all these fables cut out of the Roman 'Breviary, so that, at length, every body may understand that they are only fables: '*cum scilicet inter 'omnes convenerit de eorum falsitate.*' Baronius weakly 'defends them in order to reply, in some way, to the 'violent complaints of the most learned men, who ask

¹ *Art de Vérifier les Dates*, edit. de 1783, t. 1, p. 224.

² *Hist. Générale des Auteurs Sacrés et Ecclésiastiques*, iii. p. 685.

³ I add, that the statement of Dom Cellier still has its meaning at the present day. It would be an important work to undertake this.

‘how they can possibly allow such forgeries to remain
‘in the Roman Breviary, and read them publicly in
‘the Church.’”¹

Whatever it may be about these fables, which they no longer dared to maintain in the seventeenth century, we find them in the nineteenth in the Roman Breviary. Is it a crime to complain as the wisest men in the time of Baronius did, according to the Bollandists? No, it is not a crime; it is a duty. It is a duty to repeat unceasingly that God has no need of our falsehoods; that neither the Church, nor the Papacy, nor Saint Peter, as Melchior Cano shows, have any need of our stratagems for their service.

X.

We have just given eight examples of this curious audacity of assertion and negation corrected each instant by humiliating errors. But we are far from having said all. This, I think, is the most strange. It is the *ensemble* of the discussion upon the question of Honorius. If ever this school of error produced a *chef d'œuvre* of audacity, it is here.

Up till this time, the defenders of Honorius, knowing well the weakness of their cause, kept themselves on the defensive, and pleaded extenuating circumstances.

No one can deny, without telling a falsehood, that three Œcumenical Councils condemned Honorius as heretical.

¹ *Prophæcum ad Acta Sanctorum, Maii.*

No one can deny that, in the profession of faith of the Popes, from the time of the Sixth Council, and during several centuries, Honorius was anathematized as heretical.

Neither can they deny that the ancient Roman Breviaries, in the instruction of Leo II., from the time of the introduction of his Office shortly after the Sixth Council (*sanctum synodum NUPER in regia urbe celebratam*, says the Instruction), until about the seventeenth century,—that is to say, during nearly from eight to nine centuries,—have proclaimed the condemnation of Honorius as heretical and as a Monotholite: “*In qua Synodo condemnati sunt Sergius, Cyrus, Honorius, . . . &c., qui unam voluntatem et operationem in domino Jesu Christi dixerunt vel prædicaverunt.*” Out of thirty ancient Breviaries which are in the Imperial Library, about twenty-five are found to speak of the Sixth Council, and to mention the condemnation of Honorius in terms absolutely decisive. A few others only do not speak of the Sixth Council.

But the new Breviaries, in the reform of the sixteenth century, preserve the Instruction, and speak of the Sixth Council, and take out the name of Honorius as if with an eraser: “*In Breviario Romano hæc eraserunt,*” says Bossuet: and he adds, as we have already seen, “You hide the *Liber Diurnus*, ‘you erase the Roman Breviary; but the more efforts ‘you make to stifle the truth, the more it shines ‘forth.’”

Such are the facts, and this is why the defenders of Honorius, knowing well the badness of their cause, keep themselves always upon a modest defensive.

But, behold! quite another kind of advocate presents himself, and altogether changes the mode of fighting. He no longer defends, he attacks. And he attacks with insult all those who dare to speak of the condemnation of Honorius. He does not justify the mutilation of the Roman Breviary, with which every one, together with Bossuet, reproaches this school. It is not a question of mutilation, he says to us; it is a question of *intrusion*? Yes, you have introduced the name of Honorius into a passage which ought not to contain it! "Yes, the Intrusion of his name into the passage is simply a calumny, and an absurdity. The letter of Honorius is in the hands of everybody; and it is not possible to travesty it to this extent, without falsifying it. Every honest man would have effaced the name of Honorius from a list upon which he ought not to figure."¹

Thus speaks Dom Guéranger. Assuredly this is the boldest thing ever uttered in favour of Honorius.

Let us stop. This is well worth a little attention.

In fact, either there is a *mutilation* in this matter of Honorius, or there is an *intrusion*. That is evident.

To all those who understand the question, and who are not members, deceivers or deceived, of the school of error, the mutilation is clear. To explain this

¹ Dom Guéranger (p. 27.) Several of our critics are satisfied with saying that the erasing the name of Honorius "was desired from filial piety."

mutilation, it is sufficient to admit that a Secretary of the Commission of the Breviary, under Pius V., did, I do not say through bad faith, I say through the false system,—and the false system existed in this respect in Baronius and Bellarmine,—take away the name of Honorius.

It is enough that this Secretary, like Bellarmine, thinks that the taking away the word ‘*animas*’ in the prayer of S. Peter, took place by a grand act of Divine Providence : “*Fortasse non sine magna Dei providentia.*”

It is enough that this Secretary must have been of a disposition of the same kind as Dom Guéranger ; a man capable of maintaining that Honorius has been calumniated in an absurd way during nearly a thousand years by the whole Church ; capable of maintaining that the name of Honorius was introduced by a detestable *intrusion* into the list of those condemned ; capable of declaring that an honest man must have the courage at length to suppress, in all ecclesiastical monuments, the name of Honorius, who ought not to appear there in any such a way.

This hypothesis is sufficient to explain this mutilation and the others, as well as all the interpolations, since Dom Guéranger, we see, approves and justifies everything, now that the facts and the passages are much better known than then.

Now, this hypothesis I admit. Is it, then, to calumniate the whole Church, to admit that a man might have been met with in the sixteenth century,

such as Dom Guéranger, who possessed the same intellectual character, the same systematic errors, the same resolution in his treatment of texts and facts ?

Let me be allowed a short digression for my defence.

Is the admitting this hypothesis, I ask again, insulting the Universal Church ? is it insulting the Roman Church ? is it insulting the Papacy ? is it insulting even Baronius or Bellarmine ? They have invented absurd systems of defence, “unworthy of such great minds,” as Bossuet expresses it. But, at all events, they are neither the Papacy nor the Church.

They have desired in theology the sovereignty of the end in view. They have striven for this end by fables, by subtleties, by sophisms. But these men, in their passions and their errors, are they then the Church ? are they the Roman Church, the Mother and Mistress of the Churches ? are they the Papacy ? He who dares to confound the loyal and necessary condemnation of these faults with an attack upon the Roman Church, he it is who utters a calumny !

But let us return to our principal question.

Whatever may be the hypothesis which they admit, the mutilation is a fact ; and it is towards the end of the sixteenth century that the name of Honorius was taken out of the Roman Breviary.

But it is on this, as we have said, that the absolute defender of Honorius stands up, and cries out : “There is here no *mutilation* ; it is an *intrusion* that we must call it.”

The *intrusion* of the name of Honorius into the list of heretics must have taken place, according to Dom Guéranger, in or by the Sixth Council ; a hundred years after, in or by the Seventh Council ; a hundred years later, in or by the Eighth ! The *intrusion* took place in the Letters of Popes and Emperors ; in the Professions of Faith of the Popes, in the *Liber Pontificalis*, and during several centuries in the Roman Breviary ! Now, “the intrusion of this name into the ‘passage is a calumny or an absurdity . . . The ‘Letter of Honorius is in the hands of every one ; and ‘it is not possible to travesty it to this extent, without ‘falsifying it.”

Here, then, according to Dom Guéranger, is the Universal Church, by the voice of Œcumenical Councils and Popes, and the perpetual language of the most respectable texts, uttering (whoever may have been the author of the intrusion), uttering, I say, during centuries, upon an essential point of her doctrinal life, “a calumny and an absurdity.” “An honest man” must needs intervene at last, after a thousand years, to put an end to calumny and absurdity. And this “honest man” is he who, in the sixteenth century, mutilated the Roman Breviary !

Who, then, is it here who calumniates the Church ?

XI.

Let us study a little closer the system of defence by which Dom Guéranger pleads, after all, the cause of Honorius.

That which, in this question, is immutable and absolutely superior to every effort of the adverse school, is the fact of the three Œcumenical Councils condemning Honorius in their dogmatic decrees.

What is the audacious defender about to dare to undertake against these three dogmatic decrees, delivered from century to century, a hundred years apart, by three Œcumenical Councils,—that is to say, by the whole Church repeating, three times, the same declaration?

Here he is. He introduces a novel theology of the Councils.

He teaches this. The canonical text of the Councils is not found in the canons of the Councils: it is found only in the Letter of the Pope, who approves the Council. This Letter is the true text, the text canonical, theological, with which it is possible to argue. As to the text itself of the canons or dogmatic decrees, this text weighed, considered, proclaimed, and promulgated by the Councils, this text is no longer of importance.

No reader assuredly would be able to believe in the existence of this theology, or would understand it, without having considered it in its source. Listen:

Here is the dogmatic decree of the Sixth Council upon the case of Honorius. This decree, or canon, condemns as "*instruments of Satan*, Theodore of Pharan, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter of Constantinople, likewise Honorius, Pope of old Rome."

And here is the Letter of the Pope: "Honorius did

‘not cause the doctrine of this Apostolic Church to shine forth, but by a profane treason, has left the faith, which ought to be without spot, exposed to destruction.’”

You see these two texts ; the text of the Council, and the text of S. Leo.

Now, of these two texts, which is the true text of the Sixth Council ?

Reply : The text of S. Leo.

Here, then, I affirm, is the theory applied to the particular case : “Honorius did not cause to shine,” &c. This last phrase is everything. The canon which precedes, “We have anathematized,” &c., is nothing ?

“Yes,” cries Dom Guéranger, speaking of the text of S. Leo, “*here, then, is the Sixth Œcumenical Council* ; here it is in its veritable purport ! here it is ‘. . . . the true Sixth Council ; that to which ‘the Roman Pontiff’ has given its necessary and ‘canonical form ; that which commands the respect ‘of the faithful.’”¹

It follows from this, that every Pope, after every Council, can, in a Letter, give a report of the Council. This report may be exact, or inexact ; it may be

¹ P. 18. It is so true that Dom Guéranger introduces a new theology, that M. de Margérie, in his Third Letter, p. 26 (note), says: “I am only doing my duty in ‘ascribing to Dom Guéranger all the honour of the decisive *rapprochement* ‘contained in this paragraph, I expose in my way, but *the discovery, for it is ‘one, belongs entirely to the last writing of the learned Abbé of Solesmes.”*

And, p. 33, he quotes this same passage of Dom Guéranger, announcing it thus: “Here,” admirably remarks Dom Guéranger, “is the true ‘Sixth Council, &c.”

incomplete, because the Pope might not have wished to relate everything: he can, in fine, modify and change the text of the canons. Whatever it be, it becomes the true text of the Council, *the true Council, the veritable purport, the necessary and canonical form of this same Council.*

But, if this be so, the Councils are annihilated!

Assuredly, and this is exactly what the sect desires,—the desire to abolish the Councils, and to suppress the Episcopate.

Here, certainly, is a theological discovery of the first rank. The Council is no longer at all in the text itself of the Council, in its canons and its decrees. This is not the Council *in its veritable purport*; this is not the true Council to which the Roman Pontiff has given *its necessary and canonical form*; it is not this *which commands the respect of the faithful*. No; the true Council is the Letter of the Pope, which gives their necessary and canonical form to the canons or dogmatic decrees of the Council.

This is the general theory of Councils upon which, at last, the defence of Honorius is about to depend.

XII.

This being laid down, Dom Guéranger speaks in in these very terms:

“I am,” said he, “a man who is easily satisfied; I grant that the Sixth Council did condemn Honorius. From the historical point of view, I admit the

'condemnation of this Pope as heretical by the Council, because many times in the course of the sessions the assembly *took this liberty*."¹

The Council, then, *took this liberty!* It took the liberty of judging and condemning. It took the liberty of condemning Honorius as heretical. But *the true Sixth Council*, that is to say, the passage from S. Leo, "only condemned Honorius as an unfaithful guardian of the deposit of the faith, and not as having been himself a follower of the heresy."

Such is the very text of the defence of Honorius! After which, my learned adversary exclaims, in his pity for my ignorance, that "I should have done better to have studied theology first; afterwards, the theory of Councils, and their History."²

I understand, in truth, now, the importance of "the theory of Councils."

XIII.

But let us get on.

Here, truly, is something remarkably good for the Sixth Council. Here is its dogmatic decree effaced by the letter of S. Leo. But what will Dom Guéranger do to efface also the dogmatic decrees or canons of the Seventh and Eighth Councils? Here it is: He says that the letter of Leo II., which acquits Honorius of heresy (which, moreover, I absolutely deny), he says that this letter of Leo II., having changed the

¹ *Dom Guéranger*, 1st Treatise, p. 18.

² *Dom Guéranger*, 1st Treatise, p. 20.

meaning of the decree of the Sixth Council, has by that same act also changed the meaning of the Seventh and Eighth Councils, which were held one and two centuries afterwards.

But how could such an effect be possible ?

Here it is: "The profound respect which the 'Seventh and Eighth Councils testify for the Apostolic 'See in all their acts, *does not allow us to suppose* 'that they added the name of Honorius to the list of 'persons anathematized in any other sense than that 'of Leo II.'"¹

Such is the whole argument. There is nothing more! After which Dom Guéranger exclaims: "I 'think I have replied to everything, and re-established 'the facts."

Yes, according to Dom Guéranger, the letter of Leo II. determines, two hundred years beforehand, the meaning of the dogmatic decree of the Eighth Œcumenical Council.

The Council which condemns and anathematizes Honorius as *heretical* in its dogmatic decree, cannot, by reason of its respect for the Holy See, be suspected of having had the audacity to give to the word '*heretical*' any other meaning than that of '*negligent*,' which is, according to our author, the meaning of S. Leo.

The Council, in truth, specifies that it condemns Honorius as a follower of the impious dogmas of the heretics. But the respect which the Council, in all its

¹ Dom Guéranger, 1st Treatise, p. 36.

acts, testifies for the Holy See, absolutely does not allow anyone to suppose that it intended to speak of heresy. These three Councils, in saying '*heresy*,' only meant to say '*negligence*.' No, it is not permitted us to suppose, for a single moment, that they gave to their words any other meaning.

XIV.

Unhappily, for Dom Guéranger, all these incredible efforts, and these ridiculous discoveries, are absolutely useless. A single passage, which I am about to quote, upsets everything.

Even if we should admit the theory which suppresses the Councils, even if the canons and decrees should no longer be of any value, and if we should admit everything which is found in the letters of S. Leo, all the trouble of Dom Guéranger would still be absolutely lost. By the letters alone of this Pope, the matter of Honorius is decided, precisely as the three Councils decided it.

Listen, then, to this page of S. Leo, in his letter to the King of Spain, Erwiga.

I am surprised that Dom Guéranger, who depends so much upon the passages from S. Leo, has not quoted this page, which clearly puts an end to the case, and after reading which, no one can any longer ask whether Honorius was formally condemned as heretical and as a Monothelite by the Councils and the Popes.

Here is this definitive page, which it is necessary to read, both in the text and in the translation :

“Omnesque hæreticæ assertionis auctores, venerando
 ‘censente concilio, condemnati, de catholicæ ecclesiæ
 ‘adunatione projecti sunt, id est Theodorus Pharani-
 ‘tanus episcopus, Cyrus Alexandrinus, Sergius, Paulus,
 ‘Pyrrhus et Petrus, quondam Constantinopolitani præ-
 ‘sules, et una cum eis Honorius Romanus, qui imma-
 ‘culatam apostolicæ traditionis regulam, quam a præ-
 ‘decessoribus suis accepit maculari consensit ; sed et
 ‘Macarium Antiochenum, cum Stephano ejus discipu-
 ‘lo, imo hæreticæ pravitatis magistro, et Polychronio
 ‘quodam insano sene, novo Simone, qui nuper, per
 ‘hæreticæ prædicationis pollicebatur implere, neque
 ‘rursus ad viam veræ confessionis salutem confusus
 ‘converti, æterna condemnatione mulcatus est ; et OM-
 ‘NES HI cum Ario, Apollinario, Nestorio, Eutyche,
 ‘Severo, Theodosio, Themesio in Deitate atque huma-
 ‘nitate Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, UNAM VOLUNTATEM
 ‘UNAMQUE OPERATIONEM PRÆDICANTES doctrinam hære-
 ‘ticam impudenter defendere conabantur : neque enim,
 ‘ut Sacerdotes oportuerat, Sanctarum Scripturarum et
 ‘Patrum testimoniis hoc demonstrabant, sed mundanis
 ‘sophismatibus evangelium Christi callide machina-
 ‘bantur pervertere. QUOS OMNES cum suis erroribus
 ‘divina censura de sancta sua projecit ecclesia.”¹

“All the authors of the heretical doctrine, condemn-
 ‘ed by the sentence of the venerable Council, have

¹ It is of no consequence whether this Letter be from Pope Leo II., or from his successor, Benedict II.

‘been rejected from Catholic unity ; namely, Theo-
 ‘dore, Bishop of Pharan, Cyrus of Alexandria, Ser-
 ‘gius, Paulus, Pyrrhus and Peter, former Bishops of
 ‘Constantinople, and, *together with them*, Honorius of
 ‘Rome, who consented that the immaculate rule of
 ‘Apostolic tradition, which he had received from his
 ‘predecessors, should be defiled : likewise also Maca-
 ‘rius of Antioch, and his disciple Stephen, himself
 ‘truly a master of heretical depravity, and Polychro-
 ‘mius too, a certain old man in his dotage, the new
 ‘Simon, who lately, through confidence in their
 ‘heretical preaching, promised to complete their
 ‘work, and, being unwilling to return to the con-
 ‘fession of the true faith and to salvation, has been
 ‘struck with eternal condemnation ; and all these,
 ‘preaching, together with Arius, Apollinarius, Nesto-
 ‘rius, Eutyches, Severus, Theodosius, Themesius, one
 ‘will and one operation in the Godhead and Manhood of
 ‘our Lord Jesus Christ, endeavoured shamelessly to
 ‘defend the heretical doctrine : and neither, as be-
 ‘hoved them as Priests, proved this by the evidence
 ‘of the Holy Scriptures and of the Fathers, but by
 ‘worldly sophisms craftily plotted to pervert the Gos-
 ‘pel of Christ. All of whom, together with their
 ‘errors, the divinely-inspired Censure has cast forth
 ‘from this Holy Church.”

Can anyone deny that the word ‘*omnes*’ (all) is
 repeated in this passage at the beginning, at the
 middle, at the end ?

At the beginning: All *the authors of the heresy*, amongst whom Honorius is enumerated.

At the middle, and after the enumeration: All these (*'omnes hi'*) who were heretical, and taught the unity of will and the unity of operation in Jesus Christ.

At the end, after the proof of their *Monothelite heresy*: All of whom (*'quos omnes'*) have been rejected from the bosom of the Church. The authors or readers who only quote or only read the beginning of this passage, seeing Honorius placed in the last place, and charged with another accusation, may, very strictly speaking, maintain that Honorius was added to the list of heretics, although only guilty of having favoured them. But this second '*omnes*' (all), which comes after the enumeration, shows us that all those who have just been named, are the authors of the heretical assertion: "*hæreticæ assertionis auctores:*" and "shamelessly endeavoured to defend the heresy 'which admits only the unity of will and of operation in Jesus Christ.'" And in order that they may not escape, the Pope insists, and after several lines, ends all by these words: "All of whom (*'quos omnes'*) 'have been rejected from the Church by divine condemnation."

S. Leo insists, then, here, as much as human words can insist. He repeats to you three times, that there is no exception. He says to you, 'all!' 'all!' 'all!' and you, you maintain that he intended to make an

exception, and to change on this point the text of the Council !

No man of good faith can deny this triple affirmation of the Monothelite heresy of Honorius.

Pope S. Leo II. is then in this case perfectly and precisely in agreement with the canons of the Councils. The defence of Dom Guéranger is overthrown from beginning to end. Not a single word remains.

XV.

It must be stated that each defender of Honorius has his own special system. "As their cause is bad," said Bossuet, "they cannot hold out on any point ; 'not having any firm means, they are always seeking 'fresh ones ; they pass from one line of argument to 'another, being well aware that each escapes them."

Some have had the audacity to say, in spite of the absurdity of the assertion, that all the facts and passages against Honorius were falsifications. Even at this present time, a few weak echoes of this desperate means are to be found.

Others say only, that the two letters of Honorius, which were submitted to the Council, were partly falsified ; whilst the most part maintain that the true letters of Honorius are in our hands, to testify, against the three Councils, to the perfect orthodoxy of his teaching.

Others admit that the three Councils have, in fact, condemned Honorius ; but that, out of the eight or

ten names of heretics, amongst which that of Honorius is found, the word ‘*heretical*’ means *heretical* for all the others, but does not mean *heretical* for Honorius himself alone.

Others, such as Mgr. Manning and Mgr. Dechamps, say simply that the three Councils were mistaken from age to age, and have committed an error of fact ; that the letters of Honorius, in fact, are in the hands of everybody, and exist, happily, to prove clearly the perfect orthodoxy of his teaching.¹

Amongst those who prove, by the text of the letters of Honorius, the perfect orthodoxy of this Pope, and who declare the three Councils victims of an error of fact, Mgr. Dechamps speaks thus : “Pope Honorius ‘admits the two natures in Jesus Christ ; therefore he ‘must admit the two operations and the two wills.’”

This reasoning is false, since all the Monothelites admit the two natures in Jesus Christ. This is exactly why Bossuet begins his dissertation on this point by these words : “Let us not forget that all the ‘Monothelites admit the two natures in Jesus Christ.” But Mgr. Dechamps insists, and he quotes some words of Honorius, which seem, indeed, to proclaim the two operations in Jesus Christ : “The Lord Jesus Christ ‘has operated things divine, by means of His manhood ; . . . and operated things human in a ‘manner ineffable :” “*Dominum Jesum Christum ‘operatum divina, media humanitate ‘eumdemque operatum humana ineffabiliter.*”

¹ It is, besides, *à-propos* to recall the fact, that we have not the Second Letter in full.

To any one who has not sufficiently studied the question, this passage would seem decisive. But we have the reply of the VI. Council itself, that the letter of Honorius is, on every point, only a reproduction of the heretical letter of Sergius. Sergius, in fact, proclaims everywhere the two natures ; and, upon the two operations, he says, like Honorius : “ *Unum eundemque Jesum Christum operatum confiteri tum divina quamque humana secundum subsistentiam unitarum in Christo Deo nostro duarum naturarum.*” Lower down, Sergius says again : “ *Eundem operari divina et humana. . . .*” This is what Honorius repeats.

Listen to Natalis Alexander :

“ Honorius admits that Jesus Christ operated ‘divinely in His manhood, and humanly in His flesh. He confesses two operating natures, each one in union with the other: the divine nature operating in that which is of God, the human nature executing that which is of the flesh. Now, none of these heretics expresses himself otherwise ; neither Sergius in his letter to Honorius, nor Constans in the *Type*, nor Macarius in the *Confession of Faith* which we find in the VI. Council, act. VIII.”¹

¹“ Honorius fatetur Christum operatum divina media, humanitate, et humana, assumpta carne. Confitemur duas naturas operatrices cum altieris communione ; divinam, quæ Dei sunt operantem : humanam, quæ carnis sunt exequentem. Atqui non alio modo locuti sunt Sergius in epist. ad Honorium, Constans in Typo, Macarius in Confessione Fidei relicta in VI. Synods, act. 8.” *Natalis Alexander Historia Ecclesiastica*, t. V., p. 518, 519, de l’Edition de Venise, 1778, in fol.

But is not the *Ecthesis* of Heraclius itself copied from the letter of Honorius ?

Thus, then, it is clearly shown, by a comparison of all the passages, that Honorius speaks exactly like all the other Monothelite heretics. This is the opinion of Natalis Alexander ; and it is that of Thomassin and of many others, who regard “the decree of Honorius ‘as being the foundation of the *Ecthesis* and the *Type*.”¹

Others, and Mgr. Dechamps is still amongst this number, oppose to the dogmatic decrees of the Œcumenical Councils a few passages from authors, contemporary or not, who strove to defend Honorius.

Each of these passages is quoted by Mgr. Dechamps with a cry of triumph, accompanied by this apostrophe : “Do you hear that, my Father !”

It is precisely as if, to maintain that a law voted by the legislature and applied by the executive power is not a law of the kingdom, they were to prove that, during the discussion, before the vote, some speakers had spoken against it, and during the centuries which had elapsed since the existence of the law, some authors had discussed and criticised it.

“There is no desperate loop-hole, no fable, no ‘contrivance or shift—(all these words are Bossuet’s) —to which some author or other has not had recourse, without speaking of the erasement of passages and the hiding away of manuscripts.”

¹ See Renouf: *The Case of Honorius*, p. 39.

But all these defenders together forget this advice of good sense :

“Too many expedients spoil a business. . . . Let us have but one ; but let it be good.”

Now, this is the new system which M. de Margerie has recently discovered. To this I leave it to Mgr. Héfélé to reply, who, a few days since, has published in answer to M. de Margerie, a very short treatise, definitive and decisive, upon the question of Honorius.

Let us listen to it. I limit myself to abridging it a little in translating.

XVI.

“Here, then,” says Mgr. Héfélé, “is a new method ‘of solving the question of Honorius, recently proposed ‘by M. de Margerie, in a tract entitled: *Pope ‘Honorius*, Paris, 1870 (against Father Gratry).”

This author argues thus :

1. “Pope Agatho, in his two letters, declares the ‘infallibility of the Roman Pontiff.

2. “The Sixth Council has solemnly sanctioned ‘these two letters, and with them the infallibility of ‘the Pope.

3. “It is not possible, then, that the same Council ‘could, at the same time, have condemned Pope ‘Honorius as heretical properly so called.”

Let us examine, one by one, these three theses.

Did Agatho in his letters declare pontifical infallibility ?

This is what he said :

“The Roman Church, this spiritual Mother, will never be convicted of having abandoned Apostolical tradition; never has she yielded to heresy:” “*Hæc spiritualis mater . . . a tramite apostolicæ traditionis nunquam errasse probabitur, nec hæreticis novitatibus depravata succubuit.*” (*Mansi*, v. XI., pp. 229-242.)

Agatho limits himself, then, to establishing an historical fact, viz.: that the Roman Church has never fallen into heresy. He maintains that it never will fall into it. But he does not speak of the personal infallibility of the Pope.

Now, we may admit the infallibility of the Roman Church, without admitting the personal infallibility of the Pope. And we may admit, at the same time, these two propositions: that Honorius has prescribed an heterodox formula, and that the Roman Church has never been given up to the heresy of Monothelism.

The second letter of Agatho, addressed to the Emperor, like the first, and which is not an Instruction for the Legates, affirms also that the Roman Church has never fallen into heresy.

Where do we find what M. de Margerie maintains, viz.: that Agatho taught the personal infallibility of the Pope.

There is no trace at all of this assertion in the two letters of S. Agatho.

The second thesis of M. de Margerie is as little in accordance with truth as the first. It is not true that

the Sixth Œcumenical Council confirmed any sentence of Agatho upon infallibility.

The author, evidently, is too little conversant with the acts of the Council. Besides several material inaccuracies of which he is guilty, he imagines that the letter of Agatho was approved as a whole, which is false.

The Council *examined* first whether the doctrine of Agatho, upon the two wills, was conformable to the doctrine of the Fathers. For this is how the first of those who voted, Georges, Archbishop of Constantino-ple, expresses himself :

“ Having examined the books of the Fathers ‘preserved in my patriarchate I found ‘all their testimony agreeing with that which Agatho ‘quotes in favour of the two wills ; I agree with ‘them, I profess the same doctrine :” “ *Scrutans libros ‘sanctorum patrum qui repositi sunt. ‘in venerabili meo patriarchio, inveni cuncta testimo- ‘nia sanctorum patrum quos Agatho ‘pro Dyoteletismo citaverat consonantia ‘. . . . , consentio eis et sic profiteor.*”

It is *after examination* that the Fathers approve the doctrine of Agatho, and they in no way regard it beforehand as infallible.

But, besides, that which they approve is neither the whole letter, nor the praise of the Roman Church, but the doctrine of the two wills ; nothing more.

Upon this point they load with praises the doctrine

of Agatho: as to the rest, they anathematize Honorius. But here is the *sermo prosphoeticus* of which M. de Margerie speaks thus :

“ It is, I think, impossible to imagine an approbation ‘ more solemn and more explicit to a declaration more ‘ distinct of the infallibilist doctrine.”

Now, there is here no declaration, either distinct or otherwise, of the infallibilist doctrine; and there is no approbation, either explicit or implicit, of this doctrine.

The Council does not say a single word upon pontifical infallibility. When it exclaims, “ Peter has spoken by Agatho,” it is absolutely only a question of the doctrine of the two wills (*Mansi*, l. c., p. 666); and they had just said, a few lines higher up, “ We have subjected to anathema Theodosius, Sergius, . . . and together with them ‘ Honorius . . . who has followed them in their ‘ doctrine.”

Thus, there is no vestige of any approbation whatever for the pretended doctrine of pontifical infallibility.

The emptiness of the system of M. de Margerie is thus seen to be proved.

But a few examples will teach us better the character of his writing.

The most embarrassing point in the letters of Honorius is this phrase: “ We teach a single will in ‘ Jesus Christ.”

M. de Margerie insinuates that this proposition may have been introduced by fraud; and, as if he had discovered a new proof of it, he quotes the Abbé Maximus, who quotes the Abbé John of Rome. Now, both of them, we have seen, instead of weakening the existence of the troublesome passage, both, I say, strengthen it by quoting, by way of excusing it, the very passage written by Honorius.

Another example. M. de Margerie, after having affirmed this thesis, truly a novel one, that the Sixth Council has decreed the infallibility of the Pope, has manifestly a need of finding a means of explaining the anathema hurled against the heretical Pope. Now, he who searches, finds. He finds that this word 'heretical' was taken, every time that Honorius is in question, in quite another meaning than for the others, and no longer means heretical at all.

Finally, M. de Margerie gives himself extreme trouble to prove that Pope Honorius did not speak *ex cathedra*. But what is the use of proving this, if his letters are orthodox, and if he has not been condemned for heresy?

Let us see, however, how they prove that Honorius did not speak *ex cathedra*.

"To pronounce *ex cathedra*," says our author, "there must be a positive assertion proposed as an 'article of faith. Does not Honorius put forth the 'positive assertion that follows: '*Unam voluntatem*

“*fatemur domini Jesu Christi:*” “We confess one
 “single will in Jesus Christ.”

Here is another which follows: “We have not
 ‘found in the holy letters either one or two operations
 ‘in Jesus Christ; but we admit that he operated in
 “many ways:” “*Nos non unam operationem vel duas*
 ‘. . . . *sacris litteris percepimus, sed multiformiter*
 ‘*cognovimus operatum.*” (*Mansi*, v. xi, p. 542).

But could it be that Honorius does not propose
 these positive affirmations to the faith of Christians?
 “May your fraternity,” said he, “teach with us these
 ‘things; we, who exhort you to avoid the new
 ‘formula of one or of two operations:” “*Hæc nobiscum*
 ‘*fraternitas vestra prædicet hortantes*
 ‘*vos ut unius vel geminæ novæ vocis inductum*
 ‘*operationis vocabulum aufugientes, &c.*” (*Ibid.* p.
 543.)

More clearly still, in his second epistle, Honorius
 writes: “As to that which concerns the dogma of the
 ‘Church, this is what we must hold and teach: we
 ‘must not define in the Mediator . . .
 ‘. . . either one will or two wills”

Here, then, is a positive thesis proposed to the
 faith.

But an objection is made that Honorius did not pro-
 pose this article of faith to the whole Church, to the
 whole world, which constitutes, according to M. de
 Margerie, one of the two marks of the definition *ex*
cathedra.

“I do not know whether it be necessary that the ‘definition *ex cathedra* be explicitly addressed to the ‘Church entirely; for, in this case, the celebrated ‘letter of Leo I. to Flavian would not be *ex cathedra*. ‘But that which cannot be the subject of a doubt, is, ‘that Honorius has directly intended and wished to ‘propose to the whole Church, and not only to the ‘Church of Constantinople, that which he teaches in ‘his letter.”

Thus speaks Mgr. Héfélé. To which I add the simple remark :

How is it possible to understand that a part of the Church could be obliged to believe a certain point of Catholic dogma, without the entire Church being bound to the same belief? Is not the faith itself indivisible?

XVII.

After these decisive proofs, may I be permitted one reflection upon the present situation?

Here is Mgr. Héfélé, the most learned historian of the Councils, who sums up now, in these terms, all the present quarrel :

“*Honorius, speaking ex cathedra, proposed as a ‘dogma of faith, a heresy.*”

Thus, after all the labours of learning, after all the fertile agitations of the polemics of these last days, Mgr. Héfélé, comes back to the thesis of Bossuet, viz. :

that "*Honorius, speaking ex cathedra, taught heresy.*"

I ask those amongst us who have studied the question the most, to be good enough to read four pages forming the chapters 54, 55, 56, and 57, of that *chef d'œuvre*, of Bossuet, entitled, "*Gallia Orthodoxa: Prævia Dissertatio.*" If this *résumé* astonishes them, and fills them with admiration,—which I have already seen happen several times,—let them then read the more extended Treatise in the "*Defence of the Declaration.*"¹

After reading that, read again, if you can, the many pamphlets which have just been written within the last few months in favour of Honorius. If you are really attentive, it seems to me impossible that you should not perceive, on the one hand, the firm and bright truth conformable to the traditions of the Church, taken from the eighth to the sixteenth century; then, on the other hand, the glimmers of light and the smoke, the solitary and desperate efforts, and all those marks of confused error of which Bossuet says so well: "*Nec mirum varios fuisse ac trepidos 'qui tot undique coarctati argumentis, quo loco pedem figerent, non haberent.'*" "Nor is it wonderful that 'they were changeable and fearful who, on all sides 'overwhelmed by so many arguments, had no firm 'ground whereon to rest their feet.'"

¹ *Defensio Declarationis*, lib. VII., c. xxi. to xxviii. This extended Treatise occupies only ten pages of two columns each in the edition of Gaume (1836), lib. ix. p. 345.

But, if it were impossible for you to enter into the detail of this study, here, at least, is something which is clear.

Suppose, for a moment, that the condemnation of Honorius was an error of fact, or that his name had been fraudulently inserted in the list of heretics,—suppositions, moreover, absurd,—would the adverse cause be any the better for it? Just or unjust, authentic or apocryphal, the condemnation of Honorius was accepted as authentic and legitimate by the whole Church, in the West as in the East, by Œcumenical Councils and by Popes. It is only within three centuries that it is sought to evade this great fact and its consequences. Therefore, the whole Church believed that a Sovereign Pontiff, in a most solemn act, could be heretical, and could be condemned as such. Therefore, the Catholic Church and its leaders were then entirely strangers to the systems in virtue of which they declare everything impossible, apocryphal, erroneous.

This being laid down, let us ask how, in presence of this great fact and this capital difficulty, without speaking of so many others, they dare to face these rocks, at the risk of seeing themselves overwhelmed by history, if ever, upon this point, the full light shines upon all eyes, in the meaning of the tradition supported by all the witnesses whom we have quoted.

But why, then, not wait until the light breaks forth for all, upon this point and upon many

others? Why, at this present time, do violence to a great part of the Church, brave the schisms, the indignations, the despairs, the falls, the renunciations of the Catholic faith, and the impossibility for centuries yet, of bringing back the separated Christians? Why treat the peaceful and humble assembly of the faithful "as it never yet has been treated?"¹ Why tread under foot the conviction of so large a number? "We will crush you by the votes," is the threat of political parties in the Forum, a threat unworthy of the schools of learning and faith, and the theological parties in the Church. Why not seek, in learning and prayer, the holy unanimity of the children of God? Why insult, despise, outrage, crush under foot hundreds of doctors and bishops; thousands of the faithful, enlightened, zealous, intelligent, well-informed, whose life you trouble, whose conscience you grieve?

Love, unity, charity, unanimity,² "a single heart, a single soul," all this, all the spirit of the Lord Jesus, is not this the supreme truth, living, practical, the condition and proof of dogmatic truth?

As to me, if it were possible for me to overwhelm, by a vote of majority, those who now threaten us, and who wish to destroy us; if, by a secret act of my will, I could create the existence of this vote, I would not produce this act of will. This scandal, which wounds

¹ Thus speaks Father Newman.

² ". . . Erant omnes unanimiter (ὁμοθυμαδόν) in eodem loco"

me to the quick, I would not for anything in the world, hurl back upon its authors. I should refuse to impose this crushing burden upon any of my brethren.

I would not maintain that they can define, as a dogma of faith, *that which is not clearly contained in Scripture and tradition*. And I would not admit that a dogma is evidently contained in Scripture and tradition, when hundreds of doctors, theologians, and bishops, now as in the past days, declare that they perceive, in Scripture and tradition, manifestly the contrary. Agreeing with so many great and learned Bishops of Germany, of France, of England, of Italy, of Portugal, of the East, of America, I would repeat those noble and touching words of several Bishops and Archbishops of the United States, addressed to the Bishop of Orleans: "Why demand new definitions ' which do violence to the conscience of many in the ' Episcopate? Many among us, in truth, believe that ' ecclesiastical history, the history of the Popes, the ' history of the Councils are not in harmony with the ' new dogma ; and this is why we think it very inop- ' portune to define as an article of faith *an opinion* ' *deprived, as we think, of solid foundation in Scrip- ' ture and in tradition*, whilst it appears to us ' contradicted by evidence which cannot be con- ' futed."

When such men speak thus in this of all the ages of the Church which has always had most

love for the throne of S. Peter, and most veneration for the person of the Popes, what are they, then, but the necessary curb which God imposes upon every sudden outburst? If this curb could be broken to-day, you would tomorrow enter upon that of all the ages of the Church which would show the least love for the throne of S. Peter, and the least confidence for all that which comes from Rome. But let us hope that it will be quite otherwise, and that our Lord Jesus Christ will save His Church from these formidable dangers.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

ENGLISH ORDERS AND PAPAL SUPREMACY.

BY THE REV. T. J. BAILEY, B.A.

London and Oxford: JAMES PARKER AND Co., 377, Strand.

Brighton: G. WAKELING, North Street.

Price 1s. 6d.

ORDINUM SACRORUM IN ECCLESIA
ANGLICANA DEFENSIO:

A DEFENCE OF HOLY ORDERS IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,

INCLUDING

The Statutes, Documents, and other Evidence attesting the validity of Anglican Orders; with a fac-simile of the Record of Archbishop Parker's Consecration, photozincographed, by permission of His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, from the Register in the Archiepiscopal Library at Lambeth.

London and Oxford: JAMES PARKER & Co. Brighton: G. WAKELING.

Price 30s. 156 pp., large folio.

LETTER OF MGR. DECHAMPS, ARCHBISHOP OF
MALINES, TO MGR. DUPANLOUP, BISHOP
OF ORLÉANS;

AND

LETTERS TO THE REV. FATHER GRATRY, BY
MGR. DECHAMPS, ARCHBISHOP OF MALINES.

FIRST LETTER, OR INTRODUCTION.

TRANSLATED BY PERMISSION.

Price 1s. 6d.

FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD LETTERS TO
MGR. DECHAMPS, BY A. GRATRY,

Priest of the Oratoire, Member of the Academy.

TRANSLATED BY PERMISSION.

Price 1s. each.

London: J. T. HAYES, Lyall Place, Eaton Square; SIMPKIN, MARSHALL
AND Co., Paternoster Row.

Brighton: G. WAKELING, North Street.



Gratry, A. J. A.

Mgr. the bishop of Orléans

BQ

7052

.R23

Z6L4.

